Historical Bulletin

Formerly **BULETIN NG KAPISANANG PANGKASAYSAYAN NG PILIPINAS**
VOLUME VI DECEMBER 1962 NUMBER 4

In this Issue:

The Study of History and Moral Regeneration
Proclamation No. 57 by the President of the Philippines
Does Democracy Work in the Philippines?
Rex D. Drilon
Filipino Mentality and Democracy
Romeo V. Cruz
Democratic Gains in the Past Sixty Years
Ricardo M. Zarco
Resistances to Philippine Democracy
Antonio Domagas
Man's Role in Changing the Surface of Luzon: A Skeletal Survey
Bonifacio S. Salamanca
The Three-Star General Alfredo M. Santos
Celedonio A. Ancheta
Japanese Filipiniana
Josefa M. Saniel
The Life and Times of Rafael Palma
Jose V. Tacal, Jr.
Leon Ma. Guerrero's Edition of Rizal's Memorias de Un Estudiante de Manila
Sister Maria Amelia Rosales
Rizal's *Noli* and *Fili:* The Filipino Bibles
Gabriel F. Fabella
Evolution of the Alleged Retraction of Rizal
Leopoldo R. Serrano

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
MANILA

PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

H.E. PRESIDENT DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL
Honorary President

DR. FRANCISCO DALUPAN
Honorary Vice-President

PROF. GABRIEL F. FABELLA SR.
President Emeritus

OFFICERS FOR 1962

President — NICOLÁS ZAFRA

Vice-President — HONESTO A. VILLANUEVA

Secretary — JORGE L. REVILLA

Treasurer — PACIFICO D. DUMANDAN

Auditor — MAMERTO S. MIRANDA

Governors — ENCARNACIÓN ALZONA
CELEDONIO A. ANCHETA
ESTEBAN A. DE OCAMPO
CARLOS QUIRINO
C. O. RESURRECCION
FEDERICO TUASON
DOMINGO ABELLA, *ex-officio*
HORACIO DE LA COSTA, S.J., *ex-officio*

Immediate Past President — RICARDO A. ARCILLA

Board of Editors — CELEDONIO O. RESURRECCION
ESTEBAN A. DE OCAMPO
LEOPOLDO R. SERRANO

Membership fee in the Association is ₱6.00 a year and entitles the member to regular issues of the HISTORICAL BULLETIN free of charge. Life membership is ₱100.00. Members of the PHA residing abroad are supplied copies postpaid on payment of U.S. $5.00 a year. The price of each issue to non-members is ₱2.00 plus postage. Back copies may be secured from the Secretary c/o University of the East, Manila, at the above rates.

Articles appearing in the HISTORICAL BULLETIN are the sole responsibility of their authors as to fact, opinion and style. No article reflects the views or preferences of the Editors or the Association.

COPYRIGHT 1962

By

PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

AMBETH R. OCAMPO

Ambeth Ocampo

PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

HISTORICAL BULLETIN

[Formerly *Buletin ng Kapisanang Pangkasaysayan ng Pilipinas*]

VOLUME VI DECEMEBER, 1962 NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

Page

Editorial 317

Proclamation No. 57 by the President of the Philippines 318

Does Democracy Work in the Philippines? .... *Rex D. Drilon* 319

Filipino Mentality and Democracy .... *Romeo V. Cruz* 327

Democratic Gains in the Past Sixty Years .... *Ricardo M. Zarco* 331

Resistances to Philippine Democracy .... *Antonio Domagas* 334

Man's Role in Changing the Surface of Luzon: A Skeletal Survey .... *Bonifacio S. Salamanca* 337

The Three-Star General Alfredo M. Santos .... *Celedonio A. Ancheta* 366

Japanese Filipiniana .... *Josefa M. Saniel* 374

The Life and Times of Rafael Palma .... *Jose V. Tacal, Jr.* 384

Leon Ma. Guerrero's Edition of Rizal's Memorias de Un Estudiante de Manila .... *Sister Maria Amelia Rosales* 394

Rizal's *Noli* and *Fili:* The Filipino Bibles .... *Gabriel F. Fabella* 406

Evolution of the Alleged Retraction of Rizal .... *Leopoldo R. Serrano* 412

A Second Look at Rizal's Martyrdom .... *C. O. Resurrección* 419

Book Reviews .... *C. O. Resurrección* 426

- The Father of Philippine Independence Day *by Celedonio A. Ancheta*
- The Economics of the Political Parties *by Seymour E. Harris*
- The Rich Nations and the Poor Nations *by Barbara Ward*
- The Congress of the Philippines *by Juan F. Rivera*

Contents of Volume VI, Historical Bulletin 435

THE STUDY OF HISTORY AND MORAL REGENERATION

We welcome the delegates to the National Conference of History Teachers under the auspices of the Philippine Historical Association.

The theme—**The Study of History and Moral Regeneration**—*indicates two primary objectives of the conference: first, to emphasize a civic responsibility of history teachers, and, second, to promote historical consciousness. The theme is most timely and signifant.*

Not many people realize the great social functions of history teachers. The philosopher of history provides a rationalization of the dynamics of history. The historian, qua *historian, separates the grain from the chaff, the substance from the dreg, the meaningful from the trifling, the grandiose from the naive, the transcendent from the transient in the bewildering myriads of human events. In more ways than one, the history teacher is both philosopher and historian plus something more—a moral agent.*

For it is a primary function of the history teacher to point out the moral aspects of historical events, to warn of pitfalls into which mankind in the past has unwittingly fallen, to show how great civilizations declined with the decay of morality and rise of bacchanalian orgies. If history is an open window through which man can peer into the future, then the history teacher is one who gives the light, the perspective, the insight, and the wisdom with which man shapes his destiny and traces steadily his footsteps towards the future.

Historical consciousness is a desideratum, nay, an imperative in moulding the Filipino image. True, the image is taking shape, but it is as yet vague, shadowy and almost formless. Seen through Western eyes, the image is oftentimes distorted. It is high time that history be written and taught from the Filipino point of view. This is the challenge to historians and to teachers of Philippine history.

True to its tradition of continuing active public service in the promotion of historical knowledge, the Philippine Historical Association will, through constructive discussion on the conference theme, attempt to live up to the mandate of Proclamation No. 57 by the President of the Philippines, that is, "to arouse historical consciousness and inculcate in their [the people's] mind the value of knowledge of the past as a guide in the task of nation-building."

MALACAÑANG
RESIDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES
MANILA

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

PROCLAMATION NO. 57

DECLARING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 25 TO DECEMBER 1, 1962, AS HISTORY WEEK.

WHEREAS, a national conference of history teachers with the central theme "The Teaching of History and Moral Regeneration" under the sponsorship of the Philippine Historical Association will be held in Manila from November 25 to December 1, 1962; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary that such an important event be brought to the attention of the people to arouse historical consciousness and inculcate in their mind the value of knowledge of the past as a guide in the task of nation-building.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by law, do hereby declare the period from November 25 to December 1, 1962, as History Week.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Republic of the Philippines to be affixed.

Done in the City of Manila, this 7th day of November, in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and sixty-two.

(SGD.) DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL
President of the Philippines

By the President:

(SGD.) SALVADOR L. MARIÑO
Executive Secretary

*DOES DEMOCRACY WORK IN THE PHILIPPINES?**

By Rex D. Drilon
Political Science, U.P.

With lucid and alarming candor, the author cites unconscious habits and attitudes, as well as powerful social forces, that resist the growth of democracy here. He reveals the immaturity of our people in many significant ways and feels that democracy doesn't work in the Philippines because it can't. However, he says that if our people and institutions are honest enough to recognize and admit the serious shortcomings, then there might be hope. Otherwise, he views, with characteristic mordancy, that the deepening shadows of authoritarianism will continue to lengthen. Evolution as an engine of change, rather than armed revolution, might be the way out, provided our society can wake up and be resilient to transform its present undemocratic spirit.

To the question—Does democracy work in the Philippines?—the answer could well be yes and no, probably more no than yes.

Or a better answer might be, superficially yes. And very seriously, no.

If the question were phrased differently—"*Can* democracy work here?" — the answer would have to deal with the *ability* and *power* of the people to make it work. That ability and that power are shaped and limited by the framework of the prevailing institutions. Therefore, the answer in essence could well be the same,

---

* Under the general theme of PHILIPPINE DEMOCRACY REEXAMINED, Professor Drilon's paper, together with the commentative papers that accompany it, was discussed over DZUP station ("Time for Ideas," 7-8 p.m., September 3); at the weekly U.P. Seminar of Graduate Students (9:30-12 a.m., October 13 and 20); at the Diliman Forum (7:30-10 p.m., October 17); and before a group of professors and graduate students at the Christian Center, College, Laguna (4:30-6:30 p.m., November 18). The paper was published in the Panorama magazine (October 1962); in the Philippine Journal of Education (with editorial expurgations, November 1962); and in the Historical Bulletin of the Philippine Historical Ass'n., with the three commentative papers of Messrs. Cruz, Zarco, and Domagas (Oct.-Nov.-Dec. quarter, 1962).

"Democracy doesn't work here because it can't." It can't, because of the character of the framework.

Our traditions, habits, and temperament are against the very spirit of democracy.

This judgment may seem to be too sweeping, for a good case can be made in support of democratic gains in the past 60 years. However, a counter-case can be made that the "gains" were superficial and were mostly concerned with "forms," "motions," or "words" rather than substance.

But first let us attempt to frame our own working definition of democracy. Although there are many definitions of democracy and none is all-inclusive enough to be satisfactory, it seems to me that *democracy in its pure essence is the aspiration of the human spirit to attain the highest fulfillment in dignity, self-respect, and freedom through the use of legitimate techniques, methods, and tools consistent with this aspiration.* Note that the emphasis is on the quality of "fulfillment" and on the quality of "methods." The term "highest fulfillment" could spell the difference between a people stirred by what the poet calls divine discontent on the one hand and a people self-satisfied, self-complacent, and self-righteous on the other. "Methods" could spell the difference between lights of civilization and darkness of uncivilization.

Democracy, therefore, is more than a "form" or "structure" of government with the familiar mechanics and appendages of a constitution, separation of powers, popular suffrage and representation, periodic elections, public debate, party system, and all the rest. We may have all these, and more, and yet miss the spirit of democracy. The spirit is deeper than any and all of these. The spirit is more than can be formulated in creeds, structural forms, or techniques.

At this writing, strictly speaking, in the Philippines democracy does not work and cannot work because we have the wrong kind of social institutions. Maybe it is more accurate to say that nothing is wrong with our social institutions, but something is wrong with the people who man these institutions, because they distort their functions and veer them away from the democratic orientation. The people who distort the functions of these institutions cannot help doing so because they operate under a different value-system. And, too, while individuals powerful enough shape the institutions, in the long process as the institutions become established and rooted, they tend to grow more rigid and in the end they shape the individuals. This interaction goes on forever and it is not easy to locate the elusive lines of demarcation and to determine where to detect and arrest the retrogression and where to encourage the desirable growth.

Our folkways and *mores* (the whole gamut of our habits of thinking and doing) are expression of these institutions.

There are deterministic limits imposed by his culture, in which the Filipino moves without his being conscious that he is in a psychological prison-house, fashioned by his peculiar social structure, within which he develops a deceptive feeling of freedom of choice and dignity. Hence his naive faith that, because he was handed on a silver platter a democratic "form" of government by the United States, he has automatically a democratic society. To change the figure, a simple fact is often forgotten that transplantation produces transmutation.

Democracy as a social and psychological acquirement is learned and appropriated only after a long lesson in first-hand experience. One can learn it by rote, it is true, but this kind of learning does not have much meaning and cannot last. In order for it to be meaningful and lasting, it must become part and parcel of the crystallized traditions extending back to the long past. We have had no such traditions. All we had was the experience revolving around the tribe, the barangay, the feudal land, colonialism, and of course the series of revolts, revolutions, and invasions.

For example, we make much of our democracy because we have a "democratic constitution," which shows how significantly we miss the point. Constitutions are not difficult to write, especially if there are models galore to copy from, and can be only so much paper if their spirit is not understood, respected, and implemented. Any people can have the most democratic constitution in the world and yet act and think most undemocractically. Thus, in this sense and for this reason, are the "democratic constitutions of the Soviets and of many republics in the world mere "paper constitutions."

I have said that we have the wrong kind of social institutions here, so wrong or so wrongly manned and implemented that democracy doesn't work and can't. The most powerful and pervasive social institution we have is our exclusivistic and authoritarian religion.* The merits of this great religion have been given a monolithic twist by its ruling elite at the top, and its unhappy historical record in this country is an open book for all social scientists to analyze. There is no one factor that has socially conditioned the Filipino people in such profound and seemingly irretrievable manner as this particular version of the Christian religion. This is at once its chief merit as well as its heavy responsibility.

---

* The tremendous power and influence of this version of religion can be a decisive asset for Philippine democracy if it can be democratized to a point where its members participate in the formulation of policies and dogmas, including tolerance of and coexistence with other versions or forms of worship. We look with hope to the current ecumenical council at the Vatican.

To a people so conditioned by high authority to think alike, uniformity in thought is no surprise as a hallmark of their "unity" as a nation. A phenomenon so common as censorship in all its forms—direct and indirect, subtle and frontal—is accepted without question. Censorship, for example, as to what "right" movies to see, what "safe" books to read, what "correct" ideas to write, what "acceptable" schools to attend on pain of "ex-communication," the sterile indoctrination and meaningless memorization in the teaching and learning process, etc., etc.—all this is accepted and taken for granted because of the long years of social conditioning. To think, to question, to follow wherever truth leads—why, this is unpardonable heresy.

True democracy which took long and painful centuries for the Anglo-Saxon peoples to learn is not compatible with our kind of social conditioning. Totalitarianism and authoritarianism over the whole gamut of life, encompassed in the words, "faith and morals," which a religious-political church says by implication are no less than the words of God as interpreted by an infallible monolithic source, do not encourage the nurturing, much less the maturing, of democracy here. It is worthy of note that this same version of religion, developing as a minority in truly democratic lands where the social climate is benign, such as in the United States, is a far cry from the kind we have spawned. The Spanish aims and the Filipino responses, as discussed by Phelan in his *The Hispanization of the Philippines,* are an instructive study to an extent.

The success or failure of any hope for democracy here will depend much upon the behavioristic record of our majority religion. I think the easing of the pressure is possible only if the ruling religious elite will revise its strangle-hold upon the masses and allow the energies of thought to reach and permeate all possible levels. There is no guarantee, however, that if the Iglesia Ni Kristo or Protestant or Moslem religion should take the place of the present majority religion, there would be a marked change in our social outlook favorable to democracy. For, as developed by the Filipinos in the very ecology of their habitat, these different versions of religion could be made as authoritarian as any we have known.*

Another institution responsible for the inhospitable reception of the democratic idea is our authoritarian home. Except for a very few emancipated families, our people in general, especially in the far-flung barrios where 75 per cent of them live, do not question the authority of the parents and elders, on the one hand, and the almost sacrosanct customs and traditions that have shaped our lives, on the other. In such overdictated homes, it is considered bad manners to differ with one's elders, and it is good breeding always to accord neighborhood (public) opinion due respect, no matter how tyrannical or backward. Disobedience, deviation, or variety exacts a high price. This is an unconscious extension of the influence of too much church authority.

Industrialization may change the authoritarian character of our home. With industrialization will come increased economic independence for individual persons and the concomitant loosening of too much family dependence and control. There will be a re-examination of old values and a consequent change of attitudes. If this should happen, then democracy may have a chance. But that industrialization—the real one—is far off, very far off in the future.

Our schools are in the main still authoritarian in spite of the community-type education, which is of very recent experimental vintage. From the primary grades to the university, there is still plenty of indoctrination and preaching going on and there are still many tyrants and many bigots. It has been rightly observed that teachers tend to be set in their ways, and in their thinking they are inclined to be more bigoted than the bigots they criticize. Free discussion and sharing of views, disagreements with authority, questioning of dogmas—these are still very much an expensive luxury.

Our curricula are still generally strait-jacketed and are constructed by legislative fiat. On the administrative levels and at faculty meetings and forums—all over the country—ideas are still the monopoly of school superiors, and as for the rank and file of teachers or professors, their safety lies in the discreet use of silence and conformism as the better part of valor.

Our economic institutions, rigidly "structuralized" for centuries, find the country without a middle class, which is the base of any meaningful democracy. If there are 28 million Filipinos today

---

* Although concededly a democratic version of religion, Protestantism faces the danger of being transformed into an authoritarian tool in the hands of Filipino Protestants whose outlook and value-system have not changed.

(estimate) and if 75 per cent of them live in rural areas, that means more than 21 million live in the most backward portions of the country, economically speaking. But this enormous figure of 21 million can still be swelled to, say, 24 million, out of our population of 28 million, because most of our towns not officially classed as "barrios" are in fact barrios (rural areas) due to their isolated geography, backward culture, and neglected economy.

No wonder, therefore, that a country like ours, with a few rich people at the top owning too much, and with so many poor people at the bottom owning too little or nothing, cannot understand democracy. The middle or in-between position is a vacuum and will take long years to fill, if at all. The land tenure system is hardly scratched for all the legislative attempts at relief. Strong resistance by the "haves" is to be expected, and social change on the land-tenure front is going to be deathly slow. And yet a paradox stares us in the face and mocks us, for there is right now plenty of land to be had—rich jungles and non-jungles waiting to be husbanded. But no capital, no know-how, no venturesomeness, no incentive.

Our tragedy, as I have repeatedly pointed out on many occasions, is that the Philippines, resources-wise, is one of the richest countries in the world for its size and yet is actually, also for its size, one of the hungriest countries in the world.

There is going to be no political democracy in this country unless and until there is economic democracy first, which, for us Filipinos, is still in the womb of the unforeseeable future. The dignity and self-respect, therefore, of the Filipino in terms of his present economic condition are so low as to mock the democratic requirements.

The economic development of this country cannot be entrusted wholly to the responsibility of the government, but our people, again through a wrong social conditioning for centuries, lean upon the government for many, many things, including those that they themselves can do and ought to do.

In the political realm, we do many things against every rule in democracy's book. We make so much of our popular elections. We can have as many elections as we like, but that does not mean a thing until we can make those elections clean and representative and enlightened—and so peaceful that we do not have to call out the army and the constabulary to prevent bloodshed. Imagine having a population of 28 million and the registered voters are no more than seven million at the most and the actual votes cast are a little over five million only. (These are round figures, and the difference in estimates above or below these figures is not significant enough to alter the point.)

Even if we assume, generally, that we have seven million votes actually cast in our elections (which is only one-fourth of our total population), has anyone asked where those votes come from? From the provinces, of course. When we say "provinces," we mean our towns and barrios. How enlightened, therefore, are those votes? Let us stop kidding ourselves.

And so we are called the "show window of democracy in Asia" and we like it very much, but a window indeed whose contents are really "showing." For, haven't we in the past, in many places, finished our elections before election day, as typified by the classic performance of 1949? Don't we consistently alert the armed forces and the police during elections, and shortly before and after? Don't we move with ease from one party to another on mere personal peeve and become "guest candidates"? Don't we discourage opposition parties and forge "allied majorities"? Don't we place party interest above national interest ("what are we in power for?"), and feather our personal nests in such a way as to provide amply for our future, thereby giving us a license to raid a public office with all the resourcefulness of our private lust? Don't we carry political hatreds to the grave? Don't we brandish religion as a shield to hide our scanty virtues and make it a subtle test for employment and use it without conscience to bolster our electioneering stock? Etc., etc. In short, aren't we behaving politically in a manner to prove that democracy simply does not and cannot work in the Philippines?

We reveal our immaturity in many unconscious ways, and we revealed it last November in a most classic manner when we kept repeating from the housetop a shallow self-serving pronouncement that in the presidential elections of 1961 the Filipino people had attained maturity.* As if maturity, instead of being a process of centuries, were merely a matter of periodic political elections in which almost no holds were barred. Is not the very lack of insight in the pronouncement eloquent of our immaturity?

We have yet to find another country which can compete with us in the serious preoccupation of making politics a veritable industry. Our image in this regard is reflected faithfully in Latin America, where the social conditioning is strikingly similar, but even that part of the world, which is reportedly full of "banana republics," has nothing on us when it comes to the intensity and crassness of our politics.

---

* A number of college and university professors and other intellectuals backed this assertion of "maturity", using the jargon of esoteric academism to give it respectable, if spurious, legitimacy.

The habits and attitudes mentioned in this brief article resist the growth of democracy. When and how they can be changed to create a different value-system is hard to say. Our only guide is history. Other societies, historically, have changed their social institutions, through revolutions, peaceful and armed. Armed revolutions, aside from being expensive in lives and treasure, create more problems than they solve, but they have happened in every clime and age with a relentlessness of a destiny, as if to impress a hard-learned lesson that in any developing society conditions had to become worse before they could get better.

If ways can be found to use the evolutionary method as an engine of change, provided people and institutions know how to be resilient enough to reshape themselves and reorient their spirit, democracy in this country may have a chance of growing. Otherwise, we have indeed a very long way to go, or if we are going and moving at all, it may be in authoritarian directions which seem most natural, because after all we really only had sixty years of America here, which is not even a drop in the ocean of Spain's 400.

*FILIPINO MENTALITY AND DEMOCRACY**

By Romeo V. Cruz
History, U.P.

Tracing the Filipino traits that are compatible and those that are not compatible with democracy, the author reaches the sanguine conclusion that, according to present indications, our mentality is slowly but surely moving toward a Filipino synthesis, a type of democracy based on our peculiar situation and idiosyncrasy.

Filipino mentality exhibits traits that are incompatible and compatible with democracy. If we use as indexes the political reduction of national policy to a simple contrast between right and wrong for popular consumption, the spirit of caste in our society, and the economic inequities in the agrarian and industrial relationships, then Filipino mentality and democracy would seem incompatible.

If, on the other hand, we use as indicators the rapidity with which national issues are carried to and received by the people, the growing social consciousness in society stimulated by widespread belief in liberal education, and the signs of desired unrest in our economy, especially in the agricultural and industrial sectors, our mentality would appear moving toward the path of compatibility with democracy.

For clarificatory purposes, let us attempt to answer two questions. First, what are the Filipino mental traits incompatible with democracy? Second, what traits are compatible? The questions are difficult to answer because we are dealing with abstractions and intangibles. Nevertheless, we can attempt to answer these questions because some trends or elements are quite discernible or otherwise quite apparent. Let me cite three examples by way of answers to each of the questions above.

To the first question, the following are illustrative of characteristic traits of Filipino mentality which do not agree with democracy: the sense of gratitude or *utang na loob,* mental subserviency, and the *bahala na* attitude. The Filipino sense of gratitude negates the element of freedom in a democratic state. Filipino gratitude goes beyond the present to the future generations so that despite the fact that "debts" are already paid in full, their binding effects linger on and make the debtor a virtual ward or servant or captive of the creditor, materially or otherwise. The relationship in turn produces a malevolent mental attitude on the part of the creditor. He looks upon the receiver of favors as a master looks down upon a servant. The creditor's thought-process develops to such extreme unreasonableness that he demands a ten-fold or many-fold interest for favors he has granted or bestowed. He expects the recipient of favors to be grateful forever. This kind of relationship, primarily founded on the *utang na loob* basis, would partly explain the undesirable practices of nepotism, favoritism, graft, and corruption in our government.

---

* Reaction to a paper—"Does Democracy Work in the Philippines?"—read by Prof. Rex D. Drilon over DZUP station, 7-8 p.m., September 3, 1962.

Our mental subserviency has degenerated into some sort of religion or into a worship of people whose attainments, in our own mind, are higher than our own. Clustered around this type of thinking is the "what-is-good-for-you-is-good-for-me" attitude. This leads to what is generally satirically called the colonial mentality of our people. That is why we suffer from the evils of blind imitation, of unquestioning obedience, and of excessive respect for authority. All this is reflected in undemocratic practices subverting human dignity and individual self-respect.

The *bahala na* attitude among our people approximates fatalism in the Western sense. This attitude is more pronounced and intense in rural areas where the people are at the mercy of the cyclical workings of the forces of nature. Attendant to this attitude, if not its aftermath, is the feeling of dependence, resignation, and hopelessness in the face of problems which at first glance seem mystifying. Thus individual initiative and feeling of independence, all necessary ingredients of democracy, are subverted.

On the other hand, we have mental traits that agree with democracy or are conducive to developing democratic institutions. This will explain partially the continued presence of democracy as a way of life among our people despite dangers that threatened its very existence in the past.

Our first example of traits that are compatible with democracy is the "consciousness of right" (*karapatan)* and its accompanying sense of justice. Our people have, singly and collectively, demonstrated this consciousness of right. Our history is replete with illustrations of indignation when the people's rights were trampled by Spain and America. Thus the elements of freedom and equality in democracy are in that sense safeguarded.

Our second example is conservatism. Though conservatism may work both ways, that is, it may be compatible or incompatible with democracy, nevertheless, our conservative thinking insures and prevents radical inclinations or practices against an institution which has been accommodated partially or completely in our social set-up. In this sense, inasmuch as democracy has been a prevailing climate in the Philippine scene for several decades now and apparently has been found healthy in our society, one may say that the democratic system will be protected by our conservative mental outlook from infringements of ideologies alien to it. For instance, democracy has been threatened in the 1949 elections and by the Huk rebellion, and yet conservatism, to a certain extent, protected the democratic system.

Lastly, our third example is the growing consciousness or awareness of the significance of education as an agency to minimize, if not eliminate, the ignorance and fanaticism inherited from our history and culture. Education, that is, the right kind of education, imparted to the masses of the people is a guarantee that democracy as a system will grow and the understanding of its values will deepen and become widespread.

Taking democracy as primarily a mental attitude, the question is how to account for the contrast between the two attitudes—democratic and anti-democratic—of the Filipinos. I would like to place emphasis on our historical experience as the most important single conditioning factor that led to these contrasts.

These contrasting elements in our mentality are traceable to our pre-Spanish past. The inhibiting elements in the Indic, Islamic, and Sinic influences in our culture, coupled by the limiting factors of geography and demography, were the beginning of our mentality's authoritarian orientation. Yet the element conducive to free thinking was also present because the people were left alone to develop their own culture with relative freedom.

With the coming of the Spaniards, came physical and spiritual impositions which damaged the free inclinations of the Filipino mentality. However, the introduction of Christian values which enhanced human dignity and individual worth was a blessing. These values remained dormant until the Filipino spirit was aroused in defense of human dignity in the 19th century. Filipino nationalism then was not only a political movement but also a moral revolution to free the mind from fanatical imposition and to protect the very same values preached but not practised by the Spaniards. Thus the logical outcome was the merging of democracy, especially those aspects dealing with civil liberties and fundamental rights, with nationalism.

The Filipino advances toward mind-emancipation were, however, interrupted by American imperialism. America reinforced democracy in the country with her educational system which, however, stressed her heritage. This led in turn to the further demarcation of colonial mentality, that attitude of the mind appreciating and exalting foreign values more than one's own. In the face of this challenge, the Filipinos responded by utilizing American democratic values to advance the interest of nationalism. The resulting development both alarmed and surprised the Americans. The Filipinos did not hesitate to use extra-constitutional tools and practices which were nevertheless democratic. This placed the Americans in the difficult position of either suppressing or tolerating these developments. Finally, they decided on a policy of toleration. They were probably consoled by the fact that those extra-constitutional values and practices were based on American democratic traditions. Thus the unintended contribution of America to the nationalistic struggle of the period was the creation of intellectual mutants like Quezon and Osmeña. Under the leadership of these two Filipino statesmen, the people sacrificed American-taught democratic institutions in favor of a Filipino-synthesized democracy.

In the light of historical experience, we thus account for the marked contrasts in our mental attitudes toward democracy. We cannot foretell the next stage in this drama because of incompatible and compatible traits in our attitudes, but it seems there are healthy indications that our mentality is slowly but surely moving toward a Filipino-synthesis, a type of democracy based on our peculiar situation and idiosyncrasy.

*DEMOCRATIC GAINS IN THE PAST SIXTY YEARS**

By Ricardo M. Zarco
Sociology, U.P.

This paper sets out to prove that democracy has not only penetrated but challenged and even changed some of our authoritarian Filipino traditions. The author emphasizes, however, that it is not feasible to "democratize" all our social institutions, stating that democracy as an attitude and as a system is desired only in certain organizations.

While all the basic social institutions in the Philippines are authoritarian in structure and function, there are a few democratic gains that have occurred in the past 60 years.

I agree with Prof. Drilon that a democratic mental attitude is in great conflict with our family organization, industry and agriculture, religion, past government, and the old colonial educational system. The democracy handed down to us by our American conquerors is so little understood and so superficially accepted that we could pay it no more than lip service at best, all the while practicing our non-democratic ways according as our past seems to determine.

My thesis, however, is that there have been significant gains during the past 60 years, and democracy has penetrated some of our traditions, challenged them, and in some ways changed them. Here are some of the gains:

1. *The growing size of our electorate.* In a totalitarian or authoritarian government, there is no electorate. In our country one-fourth (1/4) or seven million out of our total population of 28 million registered in the last presidential election. Five million actually voted.

The democratic system of government allows and encourages and in fact requires greater popular participation in the selection of leaders. Twenty-five per cent of our population as voters is not such a bad-sized electorate, considering the fact that our population is young in composition. Contrasted to the conditions of 60 years ago, this is obviously a gain in spite of the fact that many do not, and cannot, yet vote wisely and intelligently.

---

* Reaction to a paper—"Does Democracy Work in the Philippines?"—read by Prof. Rex D. Drilon over DZUP station, 7-8 p.m., September 3, 1962.

2. *Religious pluralism.* There are at least five versions of religion today from which a Filipino may choose, or which a Filipino may repudiate altogether. During the Spanish colonial rule, it was dangerous to declare oneself a non-believer or non-Catholic. The coercive influence of the Catholic church was pervasive upon government and education, and even upon agriculture. This fact prevented the rise of democratic attitudes. The pervasive as well as the coercive influence of the Catholic church has somewhat lessened today because of the spread and challenge of different ideas and, undoubtedly, this change is salutary in favor of the possibilities of democratic growth.

3. *Increased educational institutions and educational participation.* The average educational level of the Filipino today is four years of schooling. There are more students today in school compared to those of 60 years ago, and certainly the quality of education has become more liberal. Due to the increase of our student population, there has taken place a corresponding increase in functional literacy. Literacy is a basic requirement of a democratic system of government. A functionally literate person has the greater likelihood of participating in, and learning the ways of, a democratic social order than another person who is not literate.

Academic freedom is allowed to thrive in state universities as provided by the Philippine Constitution. This is certainly a far cry from what used to be under the Spaniards. (Although the academic freedom for state universities mentioned in the Constitution may be subverted at the highest political and executive level by packing the governing boards of regents of such universities.)

4. *The gradual rise of labor unions in Philippine industry.* Philippine industry is predominantly paternalistic and authoritarian. Today, however, organized labor has the legal right to bargain collectively with management. Registered unions are increasing in number, although because of the young history of unionism in this country there are as yet only a few ones under honest leadership. Unionism, however, whenever it becomes too powerful, tends to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. As a safeguard against this trend, the University of the Philippines has accepted from the U.S. government a U.S.-built and largely -financed Asian Labor Educa-

tion Center, the main mission of which is to develop progressive unions and avoid mob rule.

These are some of our many democratic gains. We all agree that they are far from ideal, but certainly they are forward steps.

Aside from these gains, however, I wish to emphasize that it is not altogether feasible to "democratize" all our social institutions. For even the most democratic societies or nations have very authoritarian or totalitarian sub-institutions within them. Democracy as an attitude and as an organizational system is desired only in certain organizations. Democracy, for example, is not found to be functional in military organizations. In penitentiaries, the organization within is totalitarian, or at least authoritarian. In the family, the parents and the young children do not have the same rights and privileges even under a most advanced democratic system. For these very reasons, care should be exercised in desiring democracy over authoritarianism, or vice-versa, for each organizational system has its own advantages as well as inherent defects, and whichever of the two we may desire should depend upon our specific objectives. Our objectives, in turn, depend upon our likes and dislikes according as climate, geography, and historical experience have shaped us.

*RESISTANCES TO PHILIPPINE DEMOCRACY**

By Antonio Domagas
Political Science, U.P.

The author's thesis is that historical forces and social conditions, rather than planning or ideological opposition, have been a roadblock to democracy in this country. He points to the feudal or semifeudal social organization in rural areas, the traditions and practices that control tenancy relations, means of production, undue foreign influence, and the views on man's social functions as the factors perpetuating a colonial economy and evidencing resistance to Philippine democracy.

I have been asked to state my idea on "Resistances to Philippine Democracy." If by the term *resistances* is meant conscious deliberate efforts on the part of the people or a significant number of them to oppose frankly or undermine democracy as a form of government, i.e., a government with certain structures and processes, there appears to be no readily available evidence of such a resistance. Certain social and economic forces and conditions of life in the Philippines, however, may be regarded as resistant to the full acceptance of democracy as a way of life. These historical forces and social conditions, rather than planning or ideological opposition, have been a roadblock to the realization of the value and effectiveness of democracy in this country.

I have yet to hear that after their experience under four regimes (Spanish, American, Japanese, Filipino) the Filipinos would rather have, in theory or practice, a system of government and a way of life other than democracy. This statement does not mean, however, that if given a chance to live under another system of government that improves their lot materially, the masses of the people will in any case prefer democracy. It is probably safe to say that to the masses of the people the label of government matters not so much as the substance of day-to-day life they actually live under a given kind of government. Neither does the people's preference of democracy signify that they have realized or will realize the promises and possibilities of life which have been realized in fact in the West under democracy, nor is there a guarantee that the masses of the people cannot or will not be swayed to accept or acquiesce in any other system by an articulate minority bent on subverting and converting democracy into something alien to it in goal and character.

---

* Reaction to a paper—"Does Democracy Work in the Philippines?"—read by Prof. Rex D. Drilon over DZUP station, 7-8 p.m., September 3, 1962.

Owing to limited time, and at the risk of oversimplification, I can say that resistance to democracy as a going concern has arisen in the main from conditions found in three classes of Philippine society or from the very character of these classes as presently constituted in relation to society as a whole. The feudal or semifeudal social organization of our barrios and small towns, the traditions and practices that control landlord-tenant relations, means of production, and the views on man's social functions—all have perpetuated a colonial economy in which the landlord, the usurer, the demagog, and the unconscionable alien trader have fattened on the efforts of the masses of the people.

In thousands of barrios and towns the basic economic unit is not the emancipated individual but an organic social unit—the family, the extended family, and at times the barrio community or the tribe. In these semifeudal communities, economic activity aims at local or regional self-sufficiency, production for use rather than for sale, "not maximization of personal income but the prevention of the complex non-economic satisfactions and interpersonal relationships expressed in the basic social unit." These attitudes and conditions have prevented extensive commercial activities, capital formation, and have kept the rural dwellers on the age-old subsistence level. These attitudes and conditions have not produced the free individual under liberalism that has been the basic component unit and the source of vital and propulsive enterprise in democratic society. For these rural people, in want of sufficient clothing, shelter, and food most of the time, the structures and processes of government and the high-minded goals of government policies for its citizens are but the external trappings of the state that ill conceal the emptiness of democracy for them. Their way of life, or rather the way of life which circumstances have ordained and established for them, belongs to European feudalism, not to democracy.

Their fellow citizens in the ranks of labor in cities and towns belong likewise to the underprivileged masses for whom democracy has yet to prove its material validity. To them all the civil and political rights may be fine, but they would rather enjoy the use of them along with enough income that would make participation in the democratic way of life meaningful. As former Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia said, when people are hungry, cold, destitute, and lost their self-respect, they turn to any government, called by whatever name, that offers them succor; hungry people cannot eat the civil liberties or the national flag.

Then, too, the fact and circumstance that Filipinos do not prevail in the middle class and in middle-class activities have robbed Philippine democracy of a good part of its reality. Middle-class predominance is one of the most significant realities of democracies in Western eyes. In Western practice, if not always explicitly so in theory, democracy has meant middle-class commercial and financial hegemony, middle-class decisive control over the main outlines of domestic, financial, and foreign policies of the state. Which is not the case with Philippine democracy. Over here an enclave of one set of aliens in legitimate business and of another set in business just as legitimate but further buttressed by special legal controls, opportunistically imposed through treaties and agreements, dominate the economic scene—retail and wholesale in foreign and domestic trade, shipping, insurance; they have laid their heavy hands over the formulation of vital financial and economic policies that have systematically been continually perverting domestic laws and policies to serve their private ends. What would happen to the people's voice, formally expressed through fancy democratic processes, when their interests conflict with the predominant aliens' interests, especially in times of emergency or crisis?

Another source of resistance to the full acceptance of the validity of democracy is the intellectual class's awareness of the gap between theory and the actual state of affairs in Philippine democracy. The masses of the people in their ignorance, or the middle class in its apathy or opportunism, would not bother to scrutinize the matter of sovereignty or the matter as to who rules over whom in the land. But the intelligent or academic group is concerned about such abstractions as reflections of the realities of national or social life. When a small coterie of foreign traders and bankers actually determine the contents of the commercial and trade policies of the Republic of the Philippines and the policies as to exploitation of her resources, when by treaty another state can tell the Philippines whether to exercise jurisdiction in her own territory or not, or would have the final say on whether the Philippines should go to war or not—then who really can say that the Filipinos have genuine democracy?

MAN'S ROLE IN CHANGING THE SURFACE OF LUZON: A SKELETAL SURVEY *

By Bonifacio S. Salamanca
History, U.P.

In the belief that the study of man's activities in Luzon during the Spanish rule has an undying attraction, if not a pragmatic value, the author has made a research on the changes stemming from the utilization of land. He concludes that the Spaniards from the time of their arrival in Luzon set into motion, knowingly or unknowingly, the forces that were to modify and alter the landscape and organic texture of the island and that they should be considered as one of the most active agents in modifying the surface of Luzon.

INTRODUCTION

"Wherever men live, they have operated to alter the aspect of the Earth, both animate and inanimate, be it to their boon or bane." Thus wrote Professor Carl O. Sauer (1956, p. 49)[1] in introducing his paper on "The Agency of Man on the Earth."

> We need [the eminent geographer continued] to understand better how man has disturbed and displaced more and more of the organic world, has become in more and more regions the ecologic dominant, and has affected the course of organic evolution. Also how he has worked surficial changes as to terrain... and how he has drawn upon its minerals (*ibid.*).

This paper is a history student's case of unpardonable temerity in treading on a field that is normally outside his own competence. As such it lacks the interpretative analysis of the trained physical and social geographer.

As an exercise in historical documentation and static narration, however, the study of man's activities in Luzon during the Spanish rule has an undying attraction, if not a pragmatic value. It is in this light that this short research should be appreciated by members of the historical profession and condoned by the geographer.

---

* I undertook this study on the advice and under the direction of Dr. William L. Thomas, Jr., formerly lecturer in geography at the Yale Graduate School and presently with the University of California at Riverside. To him and Dr. Telesforo Luna of the Department of Geography, University of the Philippines, who went over the entire manuscript and offered helpful suggestions, I express my gratitude.

[1] For complete citations, please consult the bibliography at the end of this paper.

This paper will commence with a short description of Luzon at the arrival of the Spaniards. This will be followed by a study of the actual process of change, which we have divided into two periods: 1570-1777 and 1778-1870. The division was based on the fact that the first two hundred years covered by this survey was different in tempo of change from the second period.

The focal point of study are the changes stemming from the degree and effectiveness to which land was utilized—whether for settlement (population increase and urbanization), cultivation, communication and transport, and the like. A summary and interpretation of the factors of change, a short section on plant and animal life, and, finally, a brief conclusion, follow in that order.

I. THE SETTING: LUZON IN 1570-1571

Landscape. For a glimpse of how Luzon looked like right at the time the Spaniards arrived, our earliest sources are two unsigned contemporaneous documents (Anonymous, 1570 and 1572), supplemented by those of Diego de Artieda (1573) and Francisco de Sande (1576 and 1577).

These accounts give us the impression that at least four places in Luzon were densely populated in 1570-1571. These areas were: (1) Southeastern Luzon: the Bicol Region especially around Paracale; (2) Southwestern Luzon: Manila Bay area, regions around Laguna de Bay and Taal (or Bonbon) Lake; (3) Pangasinan, along Lingayen Gulf; and (4) Northern Luzon: the Ilocos Coast and the mouth of the Rio Grande de Cagayan.

These documents further inform us that the natives were quite advanced in civilization, possessing forts, weapons of artillery, and pieces of jewelry; that the land around settlements appeared well cultivated and planted with rice and cotton, and that further inland was a luxuriant vegetation of trees and nipa palms; and, finally, that gold was mined in Paracale and in Ilocos, and iron in Angat (then in Pampanga but now in Bulacan).

Three later works (Loarca, Miguel de, 1583; Chirino, Pedro, 1604; Morga, Antonio de, 1609) gave us a more concrete panorama of Luzon. Specific settlements—their location, size, how they looked like—are now mentioned.

Settlement patterns. Of the pattern of settlement, Morga (1609, p. 117) has this to say:

> [The natives] always build [their settlements] on the shores of the sea, between rivers and creeks. The natives generally gather in districts or settlements where they sow their rice, and possess their palm trees, nipa and banana groves, and other trees. . . .

Continuing, he wrote:

> The houses and dwellings of all these natives are universally set upon stakes and *arigues* [i.e., columns] high above the ground. . . . They are built and tiled with wood and bamboos, and covered and roofed with nipa-palm leaves (*ibid.*, pp. 117-118).

Population. It is unfortunate that we do not have a fairly accurate enumeration of the population of Luzon in 1570 or 1571. The accounts of these dates merely indicated that the island was populous, or seemed to be. Loarca enumerated population by settlements, but he mixed settlements in Luzon and the Visayas. In view of the impossibility of identifying which ones were in Luzon and which ones were not, since most of the names of the earlier settlements have changed, I found it inadvisable to use Loarca's figures. We are compelled, therefore, to rely on the report on the encomiendas in 1591 (Dasmariñas, G. P., 1591) even if it is twenty years beyond our earliest date. The latter is at least much simpler, although undoubtedly less accurate, than Loarca's enumeration of 1583.

According to the report on the encomiendas, the population of Luzon in 1591 was about 420,320.[2] It was distributed thus: Manila and environs, 30,040; Pampanga, which then included Bataan and Bulacan, 74,720; Pangasinan, including part of La Union, 24,000; Ilocos, then embracing North and South, and Abra, 68,520; Laguna and Cavite, 48,400; Batangas, 22,000; Cagayan, which then included the land of the Igorots, Gaddangs, and Ibanags, 91,000;

---

[2] The population estimates of 1591 must be used with extreme caution, if not totally disregarded. They were based on the number of tribute-paying families of five or six members, the number of which the Spaniards had very good reasons to magnify. For instance, an unsigned document of 1649 (cited by Barrows, D. P. in U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1905, Vol. I, p. 427) gives the population of the Laguna Bay area as 22,440. This figure is less than one-half of the estimate given in 1591!

An historical explanation for the decrease in population has been the "impact of the Hispano-Dutch war, which produced a severe strain on the Philippine economy between 1609 and 1648" (Phelan, J. L., 1959, p. 99). This produced a decline of the Filipino population under Spain especially for the period 1621-1655. Nevertheless, the same author claims that out of the total Philippine population, the decline registered was only 105,688 persons (*ibid.*, p. 101). It may be conceded that the population of the Laguna Bay area declined somewhat during the height of the Hispano-Dutch War, but could not have been by more than 50%.

and Camarines, now the present provinces of Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Albay, Sorsogon, Catanduanes, and some parts of southern Tayabas (Quezon), 83,640.

Material culture. Apart from their houses, the early Filipinos also had other articles of material culture. Mention has already been made of weapons—pieces of artillery and armor, large knives, bows and arrows, and lances with iron points (Artieda, 1573, p. 204). They also had boats: canoes, virreys, and barangays (light vessels) and caracoas—which could accommodate a crew of a hundred rowers on one side, plus thirty soldiers above (Morga, 1609, pp. 81-84). They had farm implements, pieces of jewelry, and various kinds of clothing (Artieda, 1573, pp. 204-5).

Plants and animal life. The variety and abundance of biotic resources in Luzon impressed the Spaniards. Loarca (1583, pp. 170-1), Chirino (1604, pp. 189-191), and Morga (1609, pp. 84-91), enumerated cocoa-palms (coconuts), many kinds of vegetables, nipa palms (the sap of which they tapped for *tuba*), fruit trees (mangoes, nangcas, macupas, santols, bananas, oranges, and lemons), abaca, rice, cotton, and others obtained from the sea, a variety of bamboo, betel, etc., to mention only a few.

There were also a number of animals, both on land and sea. Buffaloes, swine, goats, ducks, geese, chickens, numerous wild birds, like the *pogo,* serpents, fish, crocodiles, were in abundance (Loarca, 1582, pp. 167-169; Morga, 1609, p. 93).

"There were no horses, mares, or asses in the islands until the Spaniards had them brought from China [and New Spain]"[3] (Morga, 1609, p. 93).

Summary. Such in brief, was Luzon when the Spaniards arrived. Unfortunately, we cannot give a more detailed picture because our sources are too scanty, and dealt only with the Christianized Filipinos in the lowlands.

The population centers were those which had natural connections—navigable rivers—to the sea. Thus we have the Manila Bay area, the areas fringing Laguna de Bay and Taal Lake both of which are connected to Manila on the seacoast by wide rivers;

---

[3] Prof. Beyer claims (Beyer, H. O. and de Veyra, J., 1947, p. 2) that the horse was already in the Philippines before 200 B.C. He based his conclusion on his discovery of a "horse head carved from a potsherd" (Beyer and de Veyra, 1947, p. 35) which he associates with Iron Age migrants—300 B.C. It is well to note, however, that none of the native languages and dialects have a term for the horse. The words *cabayo, caballo,* are Spanish. We believe that from the etymology of the word alone, the horse was introduced by the Spaniards.

the Bicol region, also with a navigable river and a prosperous mining district; the area along Lingayen Gulf; the Ilocos coast; and the Cagayan river banks. In these areas, and possibly in the interior where lived the Igorots, Gaddangs, Ifugaos and Negritos, were the settlements of the natives, surrounded by their fields and forests.

The natives cultivated rice, upland as well as irrigated; they had cotton fields. They made extensive use of domesticated plants, like bananas, coconuts, nipa palms and others. They had domesticated some animals, too, but others they hunted in the forests.

They utilized forest products, possibly for food, and for building purposes, especially for boats of which they had a number. They had some form of mining in Ilocos, Paracale, and Angat. With these in mind, we are now ready to proceed further with our study.

II. THE PROCESS: LUZON FROM 1570 TO 1777

As could be expected, enormous changes in the Philippines took place with its colonization by the Spaniards. The political, social, and religious life and psychological attitudes of the Filipinos were greatly changed. But in terms of surface modification—with the possible exception of settlement patterns and the demands of an increasing population—the first two hundred years of Spanish rule did not introduce far-reaching changes.

Settlement patterns. The arrival of the Spaniards meant innovations in patterns of settlement. The Spanish *pueblo* with its conspicuous plaza, or public square, was adopted or superimposed on existing native settlements. At the beginning of the conquest, very few towns were probably created in this manner, but as new settlements were opened consequent to population increase more and more towns patterned after the Spanish *pueblo* sprang up.

The city of Manila, although it may not be typical, was one in which the original settlement pattern was altered to conform to the needs of the Spaniards. In place of the fort of logs and trunks of nipa, the Spaniards built a stone wall with a circumference of about 3,510 meters, about two yards wide and of sufficient height (Morga, A. de, 1609, pp. 137-138). Within the walled city were royal buildings—the palace of the Spanish Governor and Captain-General, the Manila cabildo, the royal treasury, and others; and religious edifices—the Cathedral, and churches and monasteries of the religious orders. All these structures were built of stone (i.e., adobe). About six hundred residential houses were inside the city in Morga's time. These were made of wood and stone, with tiled or nipa palm roofs.

Outside the walls were the Plaza de Armas and Bagumbayan, the gardens and other spaces where the people used to pass the heat off.

With the coming of the Spaniards, therefore, villages and settlements were changed in appearance. There were now to be found structures other than the houses, such as a church and its inseparable convent, royal buildings, and school houses, all constituting what has been called the plaza complex. Hernando de los Rios Coronel, writing in 1621, stated that an encomienda had one or two monasteries and churches.

The Spaniards did not only change the appearance of existing settlements. They also created new ones and effected transfers of original settlements. This can be seen in the case of present day Antipolo. The original settlement was on a low area, and was under water every time the Pasig River inundated its banks due to rain or high tide. On one such occasion, the Jesuit curate who had charge of the village exhorted his parishioners that if they expected to receive the blessings of God by hearing mass everyday even if there were floods, they must construct a church on the hills of Antipolo nearby. The natives thereupon moved the church to the site selected by the curate, and soon "began to show such haste in migrating to the new village that ten or twelve of them crowded into one house, until each one could build his own. Along the streets and around the village they planted their groves and palm trees...." (Chirino, 1604, pp. 211-212). How many other new settlements were created in this manner we do not know, but the city of Antipolo was probably not an isolated case.

Conditions of agriculture. The first two hundred years of Spanish rule was a period of relative stagnation, insofar as agriculture was concerned. In the earlier years there was even scarcity of food, which reflected the rather neglected state of agriculture.

Several factors may be listed among many to explain this phenomenon.

First of all, there was the collection of tributes. The natives were parcelled into royal and private encomiendas for this purpose.[4]

---

[4] The encomienda had its origin in Spain, although its political vestiges in Spain were not transplanted in Spain's overseas dominions. Well deserving Spaniards who had participated in the pacification were granted encomiendas. They collected the tribute and paid a capitation tax to the King (Chamberlain, R.S., 1939; Kirkpatrick, 1939; Salamanca, B. S., 1956). The encomienda was abolished in the early eighteenth century (Haring, C. H., 1947, pp. 73-74; *cf.* Phelan, 1959, p. 97).

The tribute was to be paid in gold, cloth, rice, or any other product or possessions of the natives. The payment of the tribute itself was not detested so much by the Filipinos, but the methods of collection were. The encomenderos and the managers of the King's encomiendas employed during the earlier years every conceivable means to defraud the tributarios to the extent that they paid more than what was necessary (Morga, 1598, p. 72). More abuses were noted by Fray Domingo de Salazar in a memorial to the King (1583, in B & R,* Vol. V, pp. 223-4). Such practices naturally discouraged the early Filipinos from producing more than they were producing, for anyone who showed signs of prosperity was liable to be "fleeced" of his produce.

The exaction of *polos y servicios* from the Filipinos was also detrimental to agriculture. Many able-bodied males were compelled to work in various construction projects, to till the fields of encomenderos, etc. The system attained full development during the period of the Hispano-Dutch Wars (Kirkpatrick, F. A., 1939, p. 378; Phelan, 1959, p. 99). Fray Salazar (1583, in B & R, Vol. V, pp. 211-212), has left us a vivid description of the evils of the *polos y servicios.*

> First: ...a great number of Indians [from Pampanga] went to the mines of Ylocos, where they remained during the time when they ought to have sowed their grain. Many of them died there, and those who returned were so fatigued that they needed rest more than work....
>
> Second: in regard to the many occupations in which the Spaniards employ the Indians, such as setting them to row in the galleys and fragatas dispatched by the governor. . . . At times they go so far away that they are absent four or six months; and many of those who go die there. Others run away and hide in the mountains, to escape from the toils imposed upon them. Others the Spaniards employ in cutting wood in the forests and conveying it to this city [i.e., Manila]... so that they do not permit them to rest or to attend to their fields. Consequently, they sow little and reap less....

The attitude of the Spaniards also stiffled agricultural development. They came to the Philippines not to farm but to amass fortunes. To supplement the tributes collected from their encomiendas, many Spaniards readily turned to the galleon trade; they became shippers of Chinese merchandise to the New World (Morga, 1609, p. 176; Regidor, A. M. and Mason, J. W. T., 1905, p. 10). This primary economic activity had various consequences. Many a Spaniard neglected the state of agriculture in his encomienda.

---

* Blair and Robertson.

Provincial officials flocked to the city to partake of the huge profits of the trade. Philippine manufacturing at home also declined. Considering that the Manila-Acapulco trade was not abolished as a monopoly until the 19th century, one does not have to produce convincing statistics to posit that the neglect of agriculture was one of the consequences of this activity.

Not only did the Spaniards fail to develop agriculture by their one-sided attention towards commerce, but they even withdrew the Philippines from the orbit of foreign commerce. This sequestration of the Philippines for a long period closed the islands from foreign firms who could have invested a portion of their capital in agriculture.

It is clear, therefore, that the Spaniards during their first two hundred years in the Philippines (and Luzon) failed to effect sweeping changes in terms of land utilization.

Attempts to encourage agriculture. The above presentation must not be taken in the absolute sense. Spain was not entirely oblivious to the expansion of agriculture in the Philippines. By a law of October 6, 1759, the planting, every year, of coconuts, cacao, bonga palm or pepper was made obligatory. On February 25, 1768, the natives were required by law to plant "a certain number of useful trees in every town, as well as wheat, rice, corn, vegetables, pepper and similar plants, and also to keep at least 12 chickens, a cock and a small pig" (Artigas y Cuerva, M., 1922, p. 5). These measures were calculated to promote Philippine agriculture. They came quite late, however, to produce tangible changes at the time covered by this section of our study.

Factors for change. (1) *Mining and shipbuilding.* Yet, some forces were at work although not as purposive as agricultural expansion. The Spaniards did not merely rely on the gold treasures of Montezuma, which a wholesome trade in Eastern goods had brought to their pockets. They knew, from the pieces of jewelry of the natives, that gold was available and they knew, too, that gold was mined in Paracale and Ilocos (Morga, 1609, pp. 101-102). Father Salazar's statement in 1583 (*Supra,* p. 343) will serve as an indication of the attention given to mining.

Then there was shipbuilding. The Spaniards realized the commercial value of Philippine timber for this purpose. They could easily obtain logs from the forests through the *repartimiento* of the natives. There were shipyards in Cavite, and rigging was done in Batangas (Morga, 1609). It is interesting to note that continued requisitions of natives from Pampanga for cutting timber were one of the causes of the Pampanga revolt of 1660-61 (B & R, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 138-162).

(2) *Increase in population.* Although population decreased somewhat during the last years of the 16th century and the first half of the 17th, rapid gains were made from then onwards. This is shown by the fact that by 1800, with estimates closest to our *terminus,* the population was already 1,104,745 natives and *mestizos* (half-breed, with either Chinese, Spanish, or any other foreign blood) (Martinez de Zuñiga, J., 1893, Vol. I, p. 539; Vol. II, pp. 31, 54), which was distributed as follows:[5]

Albay	62,425	Ilocos	272,415
Bataan	18,505	Laguna	73,640
Batangas	77,325	Pampanga	96,025
Bulacan	92,965	Pangasinan	102,415
Cagayan	49,440	Tayabas	30,040
Camarines	191,665	Tondo *	90,325
Cavite	32,915	Zambales	6,045

The Spaniards must be credited for this population increase of more than two times since 1591. By inculcating the doctrine of Christianity, which was one of the drives behind Spanish colonial venture, the Spaniards tempered the severity of local warfare. By creating a centralized administration, Spain curbed the occurrence of inter-barangay feuds. It was to the interest of Spain that peace and order reigned, both for the purposes of the tribute, less expense, and spread of Christianity. This she realized by bringing all the people within the pale of Spanish arms and law. This was especially true in Luzon for it was, and continues to be, the seat of the national government. Such a condition of political stability contributed one way or the other to the increase of population. Need we mention, too, the establishment of hospitals and the services of missionaries who acted also as medical men to the afflicted.

As we close our survey of Luzon during the first two hundred years of Spanish rule, therefore, it is well to keep in mind that despite its relatively static character, there were nevertheless forces which operated to transform the landscape. We shall defer interpretation of these factors in the meantime, to avoid a departure from our discussion of the processes of change. One thing, however, must be kept alive in our minds as we proceed: Luzon in 1777 was already so much different from Luzon in 1570.

---

[5] Zuñiga based his estimates by multiplying the amount of tributes by 5. He enumerated the population or tributes by bishoprics, but I have rearranged the provinces alphabetically.

* Tondo then included the city of Manila, parts of Rizal and Bulacan.

III. THE PROCESS: LUZON FROM 1778 TO 1860-70

Many things were to take place in the Philippines during the last score of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1759, Charles III ascended the Spanish throne. The new King chose to disregard the restrictive commercial policies of his predecessors. Shortly after the termination of the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), which witnessed the temporary occupation of Manila by the British, a plan was inaugurated whereby direct trade between the Philippines and Spain could be established (Zafra, N., 1953, p. 252). This was followed by the abolition of the galleon trade in 1813.

Liberalism in economic policy also affected the Philippines. She would be opened to foreign trade.

Sent to the Philippines to translate the new policies of the Spanish government was Jose Basco y Vargas. This enlightened governor would carve a name for himself in Philippine economic history.

The period of liberalism led to the lifting of the original restrictions on trade and foreigners to do business in the Philippines. This departure from Spain's original policy threw the Philippines into the forefront of economic development.

Increase in material wealth and population came in the wake of these changes in the Philippines. This, and the process which brought it about, will be the subject of the succeeding pages,

A. The Administration of Governor Jose Basco y Vargas

Economic policies. Immediately upon assuming the reins of government in 1778, Governor Basco y Vargas announced that the goal of his administration was the economic development of the country through agriculture, mining and manufacturing (Montero y Vidal, Jose, 1893-1895, Vol. II, p. 285). In his "A General Economic Plan," which he issued shortly after his arrival, he offered to confer:

> . . .rewards and distinctions on the persons who should excel in agriculture, in making plantations of cotton, of mulberry trees, and the choicer of spices [cinnamon, cloves, nutmeg, pepper]. . .; to those who should establish manufactures of silk, fabrics of hemp, flax, and cotton. . .; [and] to those who should undertake to work the mines

> of gold, iron, copper, and tin.... (Montero y Vidal, Jose, 1895-1895, Vol. II, p. 285, tr. in B & R, Vol. L, p. 48).

Governor Basco y Vargas ordered the printing and distribution of literature on the proper cultivation of cotton, mulberry tree and sugar cane. He himself looked over the planting of mulberry trees, of which there were, in 1786-88, 4,485,782 in Camarines alone (Comyn, Tomas de, 1821, p. 16).

He also sought to eliminate or rectify some of the practices of the Spaniards which were militating against agricultural development. He toured the provinces. His acquaintance with problems of agriculture led him to issue, while in Arayat, Pampanga, a decree on August 20, 1784. In this decree, Governor Basco commanded that:

> ...in the future the implements of labor—such as carabaos, plows, hemp-combs, and other field utensils... shall not be seized for a civil debt.... Moreover [those in debt] shall not be arrested at the time when they must work in the fields, such as plowing and gathering their harvests.... (B & R, Vol. LII, p. 293).[6]

Governor Basco y Vargas also turned his attention toward the problem of internal peace and order. To deal with highway robbers, he appointed special judges who were to impose excessive sentences on the spot (Montero y Vidal, Vol. II, p. 297).

The Economic Society of Friends of the Country. Of the acts of Governor Basco y Vargas from which the agricultural expansion of the Philippines received its greatest impetus, none was more far-sighted than the creation of the Economic Society of Friends of the Country. Formally inaugurated by him in May, 1781, it was this society which functioned best in translating the policies of Governor Basco into reality; and although Basco left the islands in 1787, it continued to act in the spirit which had animated its founding.[7] Through the Society's efforts, the planting of indigo, cotton, mulberry trees, and others was stepped up. In 1784, for instance, it shipped the first Philippine-produced indigo to Cadiz (Comyn 1821, p. 12).

Even more noteworthy were the Society's accomplishments from 1822 to 1871. Ramon Fernandez and Federico Moreno (1875, pp. 173-178 in B & R, Vol. LII, 308-322 *passim.*) list, among others, the following of such accomplishments:

---

[6] Full text of the decree is reproduced as "Appendix", pp. 291-301.

[7] The Society was abolished in 1809, but was revived ten years later. Its constitution was revised in 1828, went into inaction for sometime, and resumed vitality in 1882. It is believed to have finally disappeared by 1893, since it was no longer mentioned in the *Guia de Forasteros* for that year.—B & R, Vol. L, p. 52.

1822 — One of its members, Santiago Herreros, made the first woolen cloth in the Philippines.

1823 — Ordered machines for hulling rice, which arrived in 1829 from Cadiz.

1824 — Instructed eight natives in dyeing; first graduates approved a year later.

1825 — Gave first report on a paper-mill in the country.

1826 — Spinning machines ordered from the United States. Cochineal insect introduced.*

1837 — Awarded a prize of one thousand pesos to Pablo de Gironier for exhibiting a coffee plantation in Laguna of more than 60,000 trees, ready for the second harvest.[8]

1849 — Set aside one thousand pesos to acclimatize the Chinese *martin,* for campaign against locusts.[9]

1850 — Introduction of new apparatus for the manufacture of sugar.

1853 — Awarded a prize to Candido Lopez for the invention of a machine for cleaning abaca.

1855 — Offered the government twenty percent of its profits to be devoted to public works.

1867 — Society resolved to spend five hundred pesos in purchasing plows, spades, and other farm implements to be distributed among farmers in Abra and Ilocos.

1871 — Awarded a gold medal to Santiago Paterno for presenting a memorial on the cultivation of coffee and cacao, and printed five thousand copies of the memorial for distribution to farmers.

The Royal Company of the Philippines. Contributory to the development of agriculture and manufacturing during this period was the Royal Company of the Philippines which was organized in 1785 (Comyn, 1821, p. 92). Although established primarily for mercantile purposes and eventually failing to attain its goal as such, the Company did help stimulate agricultural growth. Clause 50 of its original charter obligated the Company to invest four percent of its annual profits toward the improvement of agriculture and manufacturing (Comyn, 1821, p. 93). And, as Dr. Pardo de Tavera put it:

---

* Native to Mexico; for dyeing purposes.

[8] Similar and smaller prizes were awarded to Vicente del Piño (1838), Iñigo Gonzales Araola (1846)—for two plantations, and Antonio Ortega (1847).

[9] Five hundred pesos (Mexican) and one thousand three hundred eleven pesos were set aside in 1850 and 1862, respectively, for the same purpose.

> The encouragement given by the head Compania to develop industrial and agricultural production, backed by the money it had distributed in the provinces with that purpose, had at length to produce their results and if the Company did fail, on the other hand, thanks to it, *Philippine production made considerable progress* (1912, italics inserted).

The tobacco monopoly. Until the arrival of Governor Basco y Vargas, the Philippines was receiving almost annually from Mexico 100,000 pesos more or less to help defray the costs of the royal administration. [10] Governor Basco y Vargas resolved to free the Philippines from this dependence. To achieve this goal, he established the tobacco monopoly in 1782 (Comyn, 1821, p. 100). Under this system, the government regulated not only the production of tobacco leaf, but also its purchase, and manufacture into cigars and cigarettes as well. At its inception, tobacco was allowed to be cultivated only in Gapan (then part of Pampanga), some districts in Cagayan, and Marinduque, south of Luzon (Buzeta, M. and Bravo, F., 1850-1851, Vol. I, p. 439). In 1828, it was discovered that the grade of tobacco grown in Cagayan was better. Before its abolition in 1882, the authorized planting districts were Cagayan, Isabela, La Union, Abra, Ilocos Sur, Ilocos Norte, and Nueva Ecija (Plehn, C.C., 1901-1902, p. 141). [11]

The tobacco monopoly realized enormous profits and Governor Basco accomplished his goal in establishing it. In 1782, the net profit was only 44,697 Mexican dollars. This profit jumped to 239,047 in 1783 (Comyn, p. 288). In the year when Basco finally left the islands, its net profit was already $325,701 (Comyn, 1821, p. 288), and by 1809, it had exceeded half a million dollars (Comyn, 1821, p. 289). For the period 1869-70, it yielded the government more than 1,000,000 dollars in net revenue (Jagor, 1875, p. 322).

The tobacco monopoly was finally abolished because of the many injustices which resulted in later years. But during the period of its existence, especially after 1828, the monopoly required an intensive use of the land where tobacco could be grown in Luzon. Increased production meant also the construction of more warehouses for storage of leaves and more factories for the manufacture of cigars.

---

[10] This grant was known as the *situado;* its amount was decreed "in 1700 . . . at 140,000." It was abolished in 1804 (Schurz, W.L., 1959, p. 182).

[11] Fedor Jagor claims (1875, p. 31) that fifty years after the establishment of the Tobacco Monopoly, the Dutch were to institute the "Culture System" in Java. The Culture System was patterned afer the Tobacco Monopoly.

B. Opening of the Philippines to World Commerce and Foreign Capital

The administration of Governor Basco y Vargas was merely a prelude to further economic expansion, generated by the liberalization of commerce and the opening of the Philippines to foreign capital. In 1789, other Europeans were allowed to participate in the carrying trade between the Philippines and other parts of the Orient. This was followed, in 1813, by the abolition of the Manila-Acapulco galleon trade which had operated under severe restrictions since 1593 (Regidor A.M. and Mason J.W.T., 1905, p. 18). In 1834, the charter of the Royal Company, which, like the Acapulco galleon trade, had also been a monopolistic concern, expired. Free trade, with foreign ships being charged double dues, followed the abolition of the Royal Company (Jagor, 1875, p. 16).

Until 1809, foreigners were not allowed to establish commercial houses in Manila. In that year, permission was granted to an English firm to establish a commercial house in the city. The same permission was granted to other foreigners after 1814 (Jagor, 1875, p. 16). In 1858, there were already fifteen foreign firms in Manila: English - 7; American - 3; French - 2; Swiss - 2; and German - 1 (Bowring, Sir John, 1859, p. 301).

Increased business activity highlighted the need for more ports besides Manila. This was met by the opening of Sual and Iloilo in 1855 (Jagor, 1875, p. 286). Taking advantage of the opening of the former, Thomas Reynolds, an American, established a rice exchange project in Dagupan (Regidor and Mason, 1905, p. 28).

During this period, too, earlier restrictions on foreigners to acquire land were lifted (Jagor, 1875, p. 291). This was another incentive to foreigners to invest more capital than they previously did.

These developments produced lasting results. The overall export of the Philippines rose from 500,000 pesos in 1819 to 2,674,220 pesos in the 1840's (Bowring, 1859, p. 333). The production of coffee, abaca, sugar, and rice increased by bounds; the stastistics below attest to this.

Coffee export. In 1856, the coffee export was only about 7,000 piculs. By 1865, 37,588 piculs were exported. This rose to 53,370 piculs in 1871 (Jagor, 1875, p. 96). Since it is possible that only the highest grades of coffee were exported, these leaps in export increase could have been the result of more production in Batangas, Cavite and Laguna, where the best coffee plantations were found (Jagor, 1875, p. 96).

Abaca export. Abaca was first exported in 1834 (Fernandez, and Moreno, 1875, p. 174). In 1840, 136,034 piculs of abaca were exported, followed by 273,260 piculs in 1861, 493,352 in 1864, 406,682 in 1866, 460,558 in 1868, and 488,570 in 1870 (Jagor, 1875, p. 305). Abaca plantations were then found mostly in Albay and Southern Camarines.

Sugar export. The production of sugar cane received the greatest impetus during this period. Not only were more lands opened for plantations, as in Pangasinan and Pampanga, Iloilo and Negros, but also better machines were introduced for the processing of sugar. As of 1782, only thirty thousand piculs of sugar were being exported. This rose to 146,661 piculs in 1840, 566,371 in 1854, and 714,059 in 1857 (Fernandez and Moreno, 1875, p. 398).

Rice export. Rice production also received a tremendous boost. This was primarily due to the opening of more portions of the vast plain of Central Luzon to cultivation, encouraged partly by the opening of the port of Sual in 1855. This is seen by the fact that in 1857, Sual sent twelve shiploads of rice abroad and two hundred and twenty-five shiploads to Manila. From Sual, also, one hundred sixty ships of rice were sent abroad and one hundred seventy-five to Manila in 1860 (Bowring, 1859, p. 337).

Developments in transport and communication. As foreigners expanded their investments and pushed the frontiers of agriculture further into the interior, they demanded better roads. This was answered by the timely arrival in 1830 of Governor-General Pascual Enrile, the road-building Spanish governor (Montero y Vidal, Vol. II, p. 545). With the assistance of a brilliant young engineer named Jose Maria Peñaranda, Enrile embarked upon an ambitious highway building program. As Montero y Vidal puts it (Vol. II, p. 547):

> Enrile was one of the most intelligent and industrious governors that the Philippines ever had. The country owes to him transcendental material improvements of the utmost value, such as the highways of Luzon, which have facilitated traffic between the provinces, at the same time putting them into postal communication with one another by means of the postal routes established by him. . . . Agriculture, commerce, navigation also experienced the beneficial results of this illustrious governor's judicious management. . . . (English translation in Zafra, 1953, pp. 403-4).

Social effects of material progress. The phenomenal increase in material wealth was accompanied by, and resulted in, the increase of population. Thus, by 1858 or thereabouts, the population was already 2,541,780 (Jagor, 1875, p. 53).[12] This is more than double the population of Luzon in 1800.

IV. SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS

We now have some notion of the processes of change which operated in Luzon from 1570 to 1870, or during a period of three hundred years. We shall now attempt to interpret what these processes or forces meant for the landscape of Luzon.

The primary factors for change were:

(1) new settlement patterns;
(2) tremendous increase in population;
(3) expansion of agriculture;
(4) increase in material wealth; and
(5) construction of roads.

As the nodal point in Spain's colonial history in the Philippines, Luzon received the full impact of these important landscape modifiers. We shall try to view the resultant changes by discussing them *in seriatim*.

(1) *New settlement patterns.* The Spaniards brought to the Philippines the characteristic features of their *pueblo*—the plaza or town square, parish church and *convento,* and *casa real* (for government officials and strangers). These were not part of the original settlements of the Filipinos. Houses in Spanish architecture—with the Moorish *azotea*—were also introduced.

These features of settlement meant wider area for a town or city. Thus, it involved enlarging the original settlements to give room for these innovations.

The coming of the Spaniards also meant the beginning of real urbanization in the Philippines. At the time of their arrival in 1570, Manila was the only settlement which could possibly be called a city, and at that perhaps in the loose sense of the word. Other cities in Luzon were soon created: Nueva Segovia in Cagayan, Villa Fernandina * in Ilocos, and Nueva Caceres in Bicol. There were 448 pueblos, or municipalities, in Luzon in 1858 (Jagor, F., 1875, p. 53).

(2) *Increase in population.* In 1591, the population was highly estimated at 420,320. In 1800, it was already 1,104,745, or about

---

[12] Jagor's figures are given in the Appendix of this paper.

* Modern Vigan.

three times as much. The increase, to be sure, was not phenomenal but it meant about three times as much land for settlement (perhaps more in view of the larger Spanish settlement) purposes and for agriculture (since there was no industrialization or diversified farming to speak of). More forest or swamp areas had to be cleared of their vegetation and settled or raked to yield to man's increasing needs. These become more pronounced by 1858 when the population was already 2,541,780. This is larger by more than two times that of 1800 and more than six times that of 1591.

The effects of population increase on plant and animal life, just for consumption alone, could have been tremendous.

One other significant fact to consider in this population increase was its distribution by 1858 or thereabouts. The Central Plain of Luzon, now made up of the provinces of Bulacan, Pampanga, Tarlac, Nueva Ecija and Pangasinan, contained only about 20 per cent of the population in 1591 (assuming of course that the enumeration is accurate) and about the same percentage of the population in 1800. But by 1858, this sector of Luzon was already the abode of more than 31 per cent of the population.

Certain provinces, other than those in Central Luzon, also registered unusual gains in population since 1800, which could have been partially the result of dispersion or migration as they became the favored areas when the nineteenth century economic development took place. Thus Laguna's population increased by more than two-fold, Tayabas' by more than three-fold, Batangas' by about four-fold, and Albay's by more than five-fold.

On the other hand, the population of the Ilocos provinces (Abra, Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur) registered only an increase of a little over 6,000. And the populations of Camarines Norte and Camarines Sur declined by an alarming figure of 100,000!

We hesitate to accept that the population of Ilocos increased by only 6,000, or that the population of Camarines diminished by 100,000 because of natural causes. We are more inclined to believe that these may have been the results of internal migrations. A study of the linguistic groups in Central Luzon will reveal that this region is occupied by thousands of Ilocanos, many of whom no longer remember when their grandparents arrived there. It is possible, also, that many of the original inhabitants of both Camarines moved to Albay, when the demand for abaca was felt in the nineteenth century, there to precipitate the increase of its population by about six times since 1800.

This digression into one aspect of demography strengthens our contention that the increase in the population of Luzon by 1858 worked heavily to modify the landscape by dispersion to heretofore relatively uncultivated land.

(3) *Expansion of agriculture.* The expansion of agriculture which began with the arrival of Governor Basco y Vargas in 1778 and gathering momentum in the first half of the nineteenth century was a mild form of Agricultural Revolution in terms of modern standards, but a veritable one in relation to 1570. It was responsible for the extensive culture of indigo, mulberry, and cacao trees, cotton, abaca, sugar cane, and rice, and tobacco. As a factor of change, this agricultural development was probably the most potent, for it opened more and more areas for cultivation. The export increase could not have been obtained solely from the fields then under cultivation when Basco arrived. The conclusion that hectares and hectares of arable land, especially in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon, previously covered with forest and swamp—which did not involve costly undertakings—were placed under cultivation is inescapable. The result was a Luzon which was markedly different from the Luzon of 1570.

(4) *Increase in material wealth.* The increase in material wealth also contributed toward modifying the landscape. Better, bigger, and more buildings could now be afforded by the government. The government, too, could now afford to set aside increasing sums for roadbuilding and other public works.

(5) *Roadbuilding.* The Spaniards saw the need for more and better roads in order to (a) facilitate movement of troops to areas of the island in quelling, revolts, (b) mitigate hardships of missionaries in their evangelical labors, (3) serve the ends of a centralized administration, and (4) cater to the demands of internal trade and commerce as the nineteenth century wore on. In 1800, Father Zuñiga and his company could travel in *carromatas* over good roads in their tour of the island of Luzon (Zuñiga, 1893, Vols. I-II *passim*). And Jagor, who also toured the island in 1859, wrote (1875, p. 56) of the roads in Camarines thus: "The roads were good and were continuously shaded by fruit trees, coco and areca palms."

Other factors which could have contributed to a lesser degree in modifying the surface of Luzon were mining, shipbuilding, and a little manufacturing.

In an earlier section of this paper (*Supra,* pp. 343-344), we had occasion to point out the attention which the Spaniards devoted to mining and shipbuilding at a relatively early period of Spanish colonization in the Philippines. There is reason to believe that increased attention was given to mining and shipbuilding throughout the period under consideration. Such being the case, then these two activities must be considered as effecting changes, not only in landscape but also in the nature of the soil—especially with regard to deposition and erosion.

Comyn enumerates (1821, pp. 281-2) various handicraft industries in all provinces as of 1810. Some of these were the manufacture of plows, wood and rattan furniture, weaving, etc.

The cumulative effects of all these factors could not have been negligible. The Spaniards, in the span of three centuries, assisted the Filipinos in making a Luzon which was very much unlike its landscape in 1570.

V. PLANT AND ANIMAL LIFE

In the preceding pages we tried to indicate how the Spaniards effected changes on the surface of Luzon in terms of land utilization. In this section, we shall briefly summarize how they modified its biotic life, other than human, by introducing—purposely or inadvertently—new species and effecting their dispersion; and by influencing the presence, as well as abundance, of species—native and foreign—in one area or others. We are not here in a position to determine their role in extinguishing any of the endemic species, if they ever did, since this invariably needs a longer time than I am able to spend on this paper.

A. Introduction of New Species and Dispersion of Important Ones (Old And New)

1. Plants

The Spaniards introduced new species of plants into the Philippines. In his study of the flora of Manila, Elmer D. Merrill came out with the conclusion (1912, p. 207) that "practically all the useful plants [therein] have been purposely introduced from other countries."

Merrill enumerated (1912, p. 207) 1007 species around Manila. Of these, 550 were indigenous; the remaining 457 were foreign ones (1912, pp. 151-152). Of the latter, about 178 were of tropical American origin and the others were from the Old World (Europe) and other Oriental countries (1912, p. 152).

It is highly probable that a majority of the 178 plants which originated from tropical America found their way into the Philippines during the period of the Manila-Acapulco galleon trade (1565-1813).[13] Among the more important plants intentionally introduced either for economic or ornamental purposes, or both, were avocado, cacao, camote (sweet potato), coffee, cotton (some species other than the indigenous ones), cassava, chico, ciruelas, dama de noche flower, guava, indigo, lima bean, maguey, maize, papaya, peanut, pineapple, squash, temple flower, tobacco, and tomato (Merrill, E. D., 1912, pp. 198-199).

Most of those inadvertently introduced were a number of weeds: *Celosia argentea,* L., *Cassia fora,* L., C. *occidentales,* L., C. *hirsuta,* L., *Scoparia didus,* L., to mention only a few of them (Merrill, E. D., 1912, pp. 200-1).

Of those species which the Spaniards introduced, and which were of Asiatic origin, we have the mulberry tree, tea,[14] some species of sugar cane, and others which we shall not mention anymore.

We shall try to trace the history of some of these plants, at the risk of being repetitious since some have been treated elsewhere in in this paper.

Cacao. It was imported from Acapulco at about 1670 (Artigas, M., 1922, p. 16). First grown in Lipa, Batangas, it gradually spread to other parts of Luzon and the Visayas (Artigas, M., 1922, p. 17). Jagor found small plantations in Daraga, at the foot of Mayon Volcano during his scientific tour in 1859-60 (1875, pp. 89-93).

Coffee. Coffee was introduced from Mexico at about the same time as cacao (Jagor, F., 1875, p. 95). The first seeds were test-grown at the Botanical Gardens in Manila and subsequently planted in Laguna and Batangas at the beginning of the eighteenth century (Artigas, M., 1922, p. 10).

Indigo. It was also one of the earliest plants introduced from Mexico. Its first cultivation took place in Tambobong and later in Baliuag, Bulacan, thence in Pampanga, Pangasinan, Bataan, and Camarines, and finally brought to Abra in 1884 (Artigas, 1922, p. 113). In 1784, the first shipment of indigo from the Philippines reached Cadiz (Comyn, 1821, p. 12).

---

[13] The Philippines was ruled through Mexico until about 1815.

[14] The Economic Society first tried to acclimate tea in 1834; in 1837, five hundred plants were ordered from Batavia (Fernandez and Moreno, 1875, p. 175).

Mulberry tree. On the orders of the Economic Society of Friends of the Country, Father Galiano of the Augustinian Order introduced mulberry trees from China in 1781 (Comyn, 1821, p. 16). They were first planted on the grounds of San Jose College in Manila and soon its culture was made compulsory in the haciendas of the Augustinians, especially in Parañaque where some 2,750 feet of ground were planted to it not very long after its introduction (Artigas, M., 1922, p. 7). In 1786-88, Colonel Charles Conely caused the planting of 4,488,782 trees in Camarines (Comyn, 1821, p. 16). Its culture was given up sometime in 1841 or 1843, but Jagor (1875, p. 317) still noticed during his visit to Albay some plantations as late as 1859.

Tobacco. Insofar as the Spaniards were concerned, tobacco was the most important plant during the period 1782-1882. It was one of the earliest American plants introduced; as early as 1625, its sale was already a government monopoly although it was not until 1782, when Basco y Vargas was governor of the islands, that the celebrated tobacco monopoly came into being (Jagor, 1875, p. 316).

Of the indigenous plants whose cultivation were also encouraged beginning with the last years of the eighteenth century, cotton, sugar, abaca, and rice stand prominent.

2. Animals

The Spaniards must also be credited with introducing some of the known species of Philippine animals and insects today. They imported the horse, the bullock, sheep (attempts were made to introduce Shanghai and Australian breeds but failed), the martin, silkworm, and cochineal insect (Jagor, 1875, p. 144). Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient information on the history of these animals during the period under discussion, except on a few of them.

It is possible, that the horse was introduced before 1609; Morga's work which appeared in that year contains (p. 93) the following passage: "There were no horses, mares, or asses in the islands until the Spaniards had them brought from China [and Nueva España]."[15] In 1827, the Economic Society imported "a horse and two mares of superior blood" to improve the breed in the country (Fernandez and Moreno, 1875, p. 176).

---

[15] Beyer claims (Beyer and de Veyra, 1947, p. 2) that the horse reached the Philippines in pre-Spanish days.

Silkworms were introduced together with mulberry trees from China in 1781 (Artigas, M., 1922, p. 7; Comyn, T. de, 1821, p. 16).

One of the greatest enemies of agriculture in the Philippines was the locust. To combat this destructive insect, the Economic Society decided to import the Chinese martin, which feeds on locusts and other insects, in 1825 (Jagor, 1875, p. 261). The Society made more vigorous attempts to acclimate the bird in 1849, 1850, 1862, by appropriating 1,000 pesos, 500 pesos, and 1,311 pesos, respectively (*Supra,* p. 348).

The cochineal insect was first introduced in 1826, and a second attempt to acclimate it in the Philippines was made by the Economic Society in 1861 (*Supra,* p. 347); Fernandez and Moreno, 1875, p. 176).

B. Localization of Some Favored Species

This phase of our study is mostly speculative in nature. We are sure only of tobacco. As we have already seen (*Supra,* pp. 349), the growing of tobacco under the monopoly was restricted, first, to Gapan, Cagayan, and Marinduque, and, finally, to Abra, Cagayan, Isabela, Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, and Nueva Ecija. Only in these areas could tobacco be grown, except illegally, from 1782 to 1882 (Plehn, C. C., 1901-1902, p. 141).[16]

Rice, of course, could be grown in any province of Luzon, and so could sugar cane, although they both thrived best in the lowlands of Central Luzon, Cagayan, and Southern Luzon. Abaca is confined to Southern Luzon: Albay, Camarines Sur, and Laguna in that order. The demand for more rice, sugar, and hemp in the world market in the nineteenth century influenced the intensive cultivation of one or the other in areas where they thrived best.

Montero y Vidal gives (1886, pp. 226-227) a distribution set of corn, coffee, and cacao by provinces and districts (23 in all) in the order of their output [17] as follows: corn — Bulacan, Isabela, Cagayan, Ilocos Sur, Lepanto, Bataan, Manila (Tondo), Albay, and Camarines Sur; coffee — Cavite, Batangas, Tayabas, Laguna e Infanta, La Union and Benguet, Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, Ilocos Norte, Albay, Camarines Sur, and Pangasinan; cacao — Albay, Batangas, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Tayabas, Laguna e Infanta, Nueva Vizcaya, La Union and Benguet, Pangasinan, Pampanga, Ilocos Norte, Cagayan, Ilocos Sur, Nueva Ecija, and Zambales. Montero y Vidal also breaks down *(ibid.)* the total area of cultivated land (798,794 hectares) as follows: 446,990 (rice); 123;047 (sugar cane); 36,085 (coffee); 30,580 (abaca); 22,618 (tobacco); 18,174 (corn); 5,415 (cacao); 1,930 (indigo); 759 (cotton); 39 (sibucao), 22 (wheat); 113,157 (others).

---

[16] Jagor (1875, p. 316) states that by a Departmental Decree of 1865, the cultivation of tobacco was allowed in all provinces, but in Luzon, these were the only authorized areas still.

[17] In terms of *cavans* (25 gantas or 75 liters). Montero y Vidal enumerated the production capacity of each province and district to the minimum of two cavans.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

From the time of their arrival in Luzon in 1570, the Spaniards set into motion, knowingly or unknowingly, the forces that were to modify and alter the landscape and organic texture of the island. They altered settlement patterns and added new types of buildings; contributed materially toward the development of agriculture and expansion of cultivated land; created conditions conducive to the growth of population—especially during the nineteenth century; built roads and bridges, and possibly irrigation systems; and, finally, introduced a number of useful—as well as harmful—plants and animals from a triangular source: the Old World, the New World, and the rest of the Orient.

Most of these processes of change seemed noticeable to a degree only during the period 1778-1870. Before that date or possibly earlier, the Spaniards neglected Philippine agriculture. The coming of Governor Basco y Vargas in 1778, followed by the liberalization of Spanish commercial attitude relative to the islands shortly thereafter, precipitated an agricultural revolution of immense proportions.

The Spaniards did not come only as conquerors and bearers of Hispanic culture, as merchants and, later, as encouragers of agriculture. They also came as the bearers and propagators, consciously and unconsciously, of new species of biotic life.

Luzon, as the center of gravity in the Islands, experienced the alterations that these developments were bound to produce.

Spain's decision to reach the East by sailing West also determined the time element in the introduction of new species of plants, if not their number, too. For she stumbled, in her search of the Land of Spices, upon a flourishing New World of Indians, whose many useful plants—being natives to a tropical clime which is the Philippines', too—soon became naturalized components of the biotic life of Luzon, primarily, through the Manila-Acapulco galleon which plied across the Pacific at least twice a year. Were the reverse the case, and devoid of a foothold in tropical America, Spain would not have effected the transfer of more than 100 species of American plants to the Islands, and perhaps the adaptation to the Philippines of these plants could have been considerably delayed. As it were, close contact with Mexico until 1815 effected the transfer of seeds of many plants and possibly the plants themselves which have since been familiar sights in the country. But these species from Mexico were not the only ones which the Spaniards introduced. The remainder of the 457 non-native species Merrill enumerated (1912, pp. 151-152) came from the Old World and from other Asian countries. While it is probable that many of these might have reached the Philippines in prehistoric and pre-Spanish times through the agency of man and natural forces, we must not also overlook the possibility that some, other than the mulberry, tea and some species of sugar cane and cotton, might have been introduced by the Spaniards or, if not by them by others, during their long tenure in the Philippines. The same holds true for a number of animals and insects.

Properly assessed, therefore, the Spaniards must be considered as one of the most active agents in modifying the surface of Luzon in the course of human history in the island.

We conclude our study with the knowledge that much remains to be done in satisfying the "need to understand better how man has disturbed . . . more and more of the organic" and inorganic life of Luzon. We have not, for instance, tried to collate developments in shipping with marine life. Neither have we considered the role of foreign Asiatics—particularly the Chinese. And, most important of all, we excluded, for the convenient reason of inavailability of materials, consideration of the contribution of the non-Christian Filipinos of Luzon. We have mentioned technological improvements only by accident, never discussing their probable effects on land utilization.

All these things, and many others, remain to be probed by more competent students. We hope that in future studies along these lines, some of the inaccurate data which this work may contain because of reliance upon sources of doubtful credence and the weak conclusions derived therefrom will be rectified. This writer will then have the consolation that his has not been a useless endeavor, but that it has aroused an interest in this relatively novel concept of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguilar, J. N.
1893 *Colonizacion de Filipinas.* Madrid: Estab. tipográfico de Alfredo Alonso. 411 pp.

Anonymous
1570 "Relation of the Voyage to Luzon," Manila, in Blair, Emma Helen and James Alexander Robertson, Editors, *The Philippine Islands: 1493-1898.* 55 vols. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1903-1909, Vol. III, pp. 73-104.*
1572 "Relation of the Conquest of the island of Luzon," Manila, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. III, pp. 141-172.

Artieda, Diego de
1573 "Relation of the Western Islands Called Filipinas," Manila, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. III, pp. 190-208.

Artigas y Cuerva, Manuel
1922 "Bibliographical Notes on Philippine Agriculture, Prefaced by a Historical Sketch," *Philippine Agricultural Review,* Vol. XV (First Quarter), pp. 3-27.

Barrows, David P.
1905 "History of the Population," in United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of he Philippine Islands: 1903.* 4 vols. Vol. I, pp. 411-485. Wahington: Government Printing Office.

Basco y Vargas, Jose
1784 "Decree [Concerning Agriculture]," Arayat, Pampanga, August 20, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. LII, pp. 291-301 "Appendix".

Beyer, H. Otley and de Veyra, Jaime
1947 *The Philippine Saga.* Manila: *The Evening News.* 152 pp. Illustrated.

Blair, E. H. and Robertson, J. A., Editors
1903-1909 "Insurrections by Filipinos in the Seventeenth Century" [synopsized from various works], *The Philippine Islands: 1493-1898.* 55 vols. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company. Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 87-240.
"Events in Philipinas, 1764-1800" [compiled from Jose Montero y Vidal's *Historia general...,* Vol. II, pp. 60-70, 115-140, 229-382], Vol. L, pp. 23-74.

Blanco, Manuel Fr.
1877-1883 *Flora de Filipinas.* Manila: Estab. tipográfico de Plano y ca. 6 vols. Vol. I-IV, text; Vol. V-VI, plates.

Bourne, Edward Gaylord
1907 *Discovery, Conquest, and Early History of the Philippine Islands.* Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 33 pp. [This

---

* For convenience, in cases like this, Miss Blair and Mr. Robertson's monumental 55-volume collection of translations and synopses of important books and documents on the Spanish record in the Philippines will hereinafter be simply referred to as Blair and Robertson.

is a separate publication of Mr. Bourne's "Historical Introduction" to Blair and Robertson, Vol. I, pp. 19-87.—B. S. S.]

Bowring, Sir John
1859 *A Visit to the Philippines.* London: Smith, Elder & Co. 434 pp.

Buzeta, Manuel y Bravo, Felipe
1850-1851 *Diccionario geográfico, estadístico, histórico, de las Islas Filipinas.* 2 vols. Madrid: Imprenta de J. C. de la Peña.

Cavada y Mendez de Vigo, A. de la
1876 *Historia, Geográfica, Geológica y Estadística de Filipinas.* 2 vols. in 1. Manila: Imp. de Ramirez y Giraudier. Tomo 1.º

Chamberlain, Robert S.
1939 "Castilian Backgrounds of the Repartimiento-Encomienda," in *Contributions to American Anthropology and History,* V (June 30), 23-66. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Publication No. 25.

Chirino, Father Pedro
1604 *Relacion de las islas Filipinas.* Roma: Estevan Paulino, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. XII, pp. 175-321.

Comyn, Tomas de
1821 *State of the Philippines in 1810.* [Translated from the Spanish version of 1820, by William Walton]. London: Printed for T. and J. Allman. 306 pp.

Coronel, Hernando de los Rios
1621 *Memorial And Relation For His Majesty,* Madrid, Fernando Correa, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. XIX, pp. 139-297.

Crawfurd, Sir John
1856 *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands & Adjacent Countries.* London: Bradbury & Evans. 459 pp.

Dasmariñas, Gomez Perez (prepared under order of)
1591 "Account of the Encomiendas in the Philipinas Islands," Manila, May 31, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. VIII, pp. 96-141.

Fernandez, Ramon G. and Moreno y Jerez, F.
1875 *Manual del Viajero en Filipinas.* Manila: Establecimiento tipográfico de Santo Tomas. 476 pp. Excerpts in Blair and Robertson, Vol. LII, pp. 308-322.

Galang, Zoilo M., Editor
1936 *Encyclopedia of the Philippines.* 10 vols. Manila: Philippine Education Company. X.

Gironniere, Paul de la
1854 *Twenty Years in the Philippines.* [Translated from the French version (Paris, 1853) by Gironniere himself]. N.Y.: Harper & Brothers' Publishers. 300 pp. Plus Appendix (301-371).

Haring, C. H.
1947 *The Spanish Empire in America.* New York: Oxford University Press. 388 pp.

Jagor, F.
1875 *Travels in the Philippines.* London: Chapman and Hall, in *The Former Philippines Thru Foreign Eyes,* edited by Austin Craig, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1917, pp. 1-356. Page references to Jagor's work in this paper refer to Craig's version.

Jenks, Albert Ernest
1905 *The Bontoc Igorot.* (Ethnological Survey Publications of the Department of Interior), Vol. I. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing. 266 pp. With plates.

Kirkpatrick, F. A.
1939 "Repartimiento-Encomienda," *Hispanic American Historical Review,* XIX (August), 372-379.

Loarca, Miguel de
1583 *Relacion de las Islas Filipinas.* Arevalo [Panay], in Blair and Robertson, Vol. V, pp. 39-115.

Mac Micking, Robert
1851 *Recollections of Manilla And the Philippines During 1848, 1849, and 1850.* London: Richard Bentley. 320 pp.

Mallat, J.
1846 *Les Philippines; histoire, geographie, moeurs agriculture, industrie, et commerce des Colonies Espagnoles dans l'Oceanie.* 2 vols. Paris: Arthus Bertrand.

Martinez de Zuñiga, Joaquin, O.S.A.
1893 *Estadísmo de las Islas Filipinas; Ó mis viajes por este país.* Edited and annotated by Wenceslao Retana. 2 vols. Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Rios.

Merrill, Elmer D.
1904 "The American Element in the Philippine Flora," in *Publications of the Bureau of Government Laboratories.* Series of 1903, No. 1, pp. 19-36. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
1906 "The Flora of the Lamao Forest Reserve," *Philippine Journal of Science,* Vol. I, Supplement I, pp. 1-141. With extensive plates.
1912 "Notes on the Flora of Manila With Special Reference to the Introduced Element," *Philippine Journal of Science,* Vol. VII (C), No. 3, pp. 145-208. Tables.

Montero y Vidal, Jose
1886 *El Archipielago Filipino y Las Islas Marianas, Carolinas y Palaos: Su historia, geografía y estadística.* Madrid: Imprenta y Fundacion de Manuel Tello. 505 pp. With maps.

Morga, Antonio de
1598 "Report of Conditions in the Philippines," Manila, June 8, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. X, pp. 72-102.

Morga, Antonio de
1609 *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas.* Mexico, in Blair and Robertson, Vols. XV and XVI, pp. 31-287; 27-209. [References to Morga's

Sucesos in this paper refer to those of Vol. XVI of Blair and Robertson].

Pardo de Tavera, T. H.
1912 "Results of the Economic Development of the Philippines," Paper read at the Philippine Columbian Association. Quotation is from Zafra, N. (see below), p. 322.

Phelan, John Leddy
1959 *The Hispanization of the Philippines; Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565-1700*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. 218 pp.

Plehn, C. C.
1901-1902 "Taxation in the Philippines," *Political Science Quarterly,* XVI (December), 680-711; XVII (March), 125-148.

Regidor y Jurado, A. M. and Mason, J. W. T.
1905 *Commercial Progress in the Philippines.* London: Dunn & Chidgey. 34 pp.

Riquel, Hernando and Others
1574 "News From the Western Islands," Mexico, Jan. 11, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. III, pp. 230-249.

Salamanca, B. S.
1956. "The Encomienda System in the Philippines". [Mss]

Salazar, Domingo de
1583 "Affairs in the Philipinas Islands," Manila, June 20, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. V, pp. 210-255.

Sande, Francisco de
1576 "Relation of the Filipinas Islands," Manila, June 7, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. IV, pp. 21-97.
1577 "Relation and Description of the Philipinas Islands," Manila, June 8, in Blair and Robertson, Vol. IV, pp. 98-118.

Sauer, Carl O.
1956 "The Agency of Man on the Earth," in *Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth.* Edited by William L. Thomas, Jr. Published for the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthoropological Research and the National Science Foundation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 49-69.

Schurz, William L.
1959 *The Manila Galleon.* New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 454 pp. (Paperback).

Zafra, N.
1953 *Readings in Philippine History.* New Edition. Quezon City: University of the Philippines. 631 pp. (Mimeographed).

APPENDIX

POPULATION OF LUZON BY ABOUT 1850 *

Provinces (P) & Districts (D)	Population	No. of Pueblos
Abra (P)	34,337	5
Albay (P)	330,121	34
Bataan (P)	44,794	10
Batangas (P)	280,100	None (?-S.)
Benguet (D)	8,465	
Bontoc (D)	7,052	
Bulacan (P)	240,341	23
Cagayan (P)	64,437	16
Camarines Norte (P)	26,372	7
Camarines Sur (P)	81,047	31
Cavite (P)	109,501	17
Ilocos Norte (P)	134,767	12
Ilocos Sur (P)	105,251	18
Infanta (D)	7,813	2
Isabela (P)	29,200	9
Laguna (P)	121,251	26
Lepanto (D)	8,851	48 (?-S.)
Manila (P)	323,683	28 (?-S.)
Morong (D)	44,239	12
Nueva Ecija (P)	84,520	12
Nueva Vizcaya (P)	32,961	8
Pampanga (P)	193,423	24
Pangasinan (P)	263,427	26
Porac (D)	6,950	1
Principe (D)	3,609	3
Saltan (D)	6,640	
Tayabas (P)	93,918	17
Tiagan (D)	5,723	
Union, (P)	88,024	11
Zambales (P)	72,936	16
TOTAL — Ps. & Ds. (30)	2,541,780	488

---

* From F. Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines* (1875) in *The Former Philippines Thru Foreign Eyes,* ed. by Austin Craig. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1917, p. 53.

THE THREE-STAR GENERAL ALFREDO M. SANTOS

By Celedonio A. Ancheta
Governor, PHA

This is a biography of a remarkable man whose outstanding career in the army glows with tradition-breaking precedents and proves that by sheer merit one can rise to the highest position in the army as Chief of Staff.

One of the landmarks of the history of the Armed Forces of the Philippines was the appointment and promotion of General Alfredo M. Santos to the highest position in the army as Chief of Staff. He was the first ROTC and ROSS graduate who had been appointed to such a position and promoted to the rank of Lieutenant General. General Santos was an integree in the regular force of the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

Because he was not a graduate of the Philippine Military Academy, he was often left aside in the promotion and appointment to the highest position in the army in previous years in favor of officers of equal rank but who happened to have graduated from the Philippine Military Academy, in spite of the fact that he was senior to those who were promoted ahead of him. For instance General Santos was senior to General Pelagio Cruz by 99 files above, General Jesus Vargas by 16 files above, General (now Senator) Eulogio Balao by 22 files above, General Manuel F. Cabal by 56 files above, and General Pedro Molina, who was his closest rival for the position of Chief of Staff, by 101 files above.

His elevation as Chief of Staff by President Diosdado M. Macapagal on September 1, 1962 was a deviation from the traditional practice to appoint one who graduated either from the old Philippine Constabulary Academy or the Philippine Military Academy. This is very significant in several respects. Aside from the policy enunciated by the President of the Philippines that promotion and appointment in the Armed Forces of the Philippines should be based on *Merits, Seniority,* and *Justice* alone, President Macapagal initiated at least three new points in the history of the Armed Forces of the Philippines: first, that non-graduation from the Philippine Military Academy is not a bar to any officer of the army to his appointment as Chief of Staff; second, that the position of Chief of Staff was no longer a preserved ground for graduates of the Philippine Military Academy; and third, that it gives great hopes to many reserve officers who are in the active service to be given the same opportunity to rise in the military profession as much as graduates of the Philippine Military Academy. After all, the bulk of our army is constituted by the reserve forces who are either in the active duty or in civilian life now.

The three-star general was born in Sta. Cruz, Manila on July 13, 1905. At an early age he was orphaned. His life since then was a life of struggle and hardships. He attended the Manila North High School, University of the Philippines, and Mapua Institute of Technology, obtaining a degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the latter institution.

General Santos showed great interest in Military Science not only in the high school but also in the University of the Philippines where he was ROTC Cadet Colonel and Corps Commander. The writer had the privilege to be a classmate and co-graduate of General Santos in the first class of the Reserve Officers Service School (ROSS) in Baguio at Camp Henry T. Allen in 1936. As probationary Third Lieutenant in the ROSS, General Santos graduated at the top of his class. After his graduation he was assigned to the Philippine Military Academy in Baguio as a Tactical Officer and Instructor. He held various positions in the academy as Plans and Training Officer; Secretary and Instructor, Department of Engineering and Mathematics; and Assistant Commandment, Corps of Cadets. Later on he was assigned Commandant of the San Juan de Letran ROTC Unit, Manila. Then, he was assigned as Executive Officer of the Third Battalion First Infantry First Regular Division at Camp Murphy. Because of his excellent rating as officer of all the positions he had been assigned he was promoted from the rank of First Lieutenant to the rank of Captain on September 27, 1941.

Our new Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines is one of the most highly decorated officers of the army and perhaps the one who has the most colorful war records and service during peace time. He is easily the most outstanding of the generals of the army. For instance, during the war in Bataan, General Santos (then Major) was dubbed *"The Hammer"* of the First Regular Division when he constantly pounded the enemy line thus giving no rest to them but constant fear of being annihilated by the ever-thrushing fighting regiment of General Santos. Again, General Santos was acclaimed as *"The Hero of the Pockets"* in Bataan because of his tactical strategy to prevent the enemy to envelope or to "pocket" the Philippine First Regular Division several times in those trying days of the war in Bataan which without the genius of General Santos, would have spelled defeat and of course annihilation to all the components of the division.

During peace time the service record of General Santos is very enviable. His record would again prove the fact that he was a master planner and strategist in the campaign against the *HUKS*. He successfully bagged the two top men of the HUK movement in the Philippines, Guillermo Capadocia and Mariano P. Balgos, both Secretary-General of the Communist Party in the Philippines. This surely gave to the government and the people of the Philippines financial savings and the most desired peace which was certainly lacking before the capture of these two Communist leaders. This alone besides the other accomplishments of General Santos, easily makes him the most popular and the most acclaimed public servant of the people of the Philippines.

For his bravery in battle in Bataan, General Santos was promoted to Major in the field on February 10, 1942 and awarded the most coveted medal, The Distinguished Service Cross, US Army, and the Silver Star, US Army for gallantry in action in Bataan. Not wanting in recognizing and honoring the hero of Bataan for similar combat heroism, the Philippine Government, also awarded him the Distinguished Conduct Star and the Gold Cross.

Another outstanding distinction of General Santos was that he was chosen by the late President Ramon Magsaysay to be the first Chief of the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) Military Planning Office with Headquarters in Bangkok, Thailand. This was a signal and distinguished honor to General Santos. This was a recognition of his personality as a master strategist and planner and foremost freedom fighter in Southeast Asia. After he had laid the foundation and fully organized that office of the SEATO, he was recalled by President Carlos P. Garcia to be the Deputy Chief of Staff, GHQ, Armed Forces of the Philippines in Camp Murphy. This was on June 9, 1958. At present The Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, General Santos, is the Military Adviser of the SEATO.

Our new Chief of Staff is also the most travelled of all the generals of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. In 1943, he visited Japan and had seen all the most important cities of that country. In 1946-1947 he was a student officer in The Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and visited the

U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York, and almost all the naval and military academies in the entire United States. Then in 1953 he again visited the United States and Europe as an observer in several army war colleges and military installations. He also visited Tel-a-Viv and Jerusalem in Israel, and Karachi in Pakistan. In 1957-1958, he visited the important cities in Australia; the cities of Singapore and Hongkong and lived for more than a year in Bangkok. While there he visited all the countries around Thailand.

The following are the different awards, commendations and citations of General Santos:

1—Distinguished Service Cross, US Army for extraordinary heroism in combat in Bataan.

2—Distinguished Conduct Star, Philippine Army, for extraordinary heroism in combat in Bataan.

3—Distinguished Service Star, Armed Forces of the Philippines, for the capture of No. 2 Huk and Communist Leader, Guillermo Capadocia and total destruction of Huk Forces in Visayas.

4—Distinguished Service Star with one Bronze Anahaw Leaf, for the capture of PBS Mariano P. Balgos in Bicolandia.

5—Distinguished Service Star with Second Bronze Anahaw Leaf, GHQ, AFP, for eminently meritorious and valuable services as the first Chief of the SEATO, Military Planning Headquarters in Bangkok, Thailand.

6—Silver Star, US Army for gallantry in action in Bataan.

7—Gold Cross, Philippine Army for gallantry in action in Bataan.

8—Legion of Merit (Officer) by the President of the United States for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services while serving as Area Commander of the II MA, AFP from July 24, 1954 to May 1, 1956.

9—Commendation by Secretary of National Defense, Hon. Ramon Magsaysay, on the efficiency, discipline and morale of command in 1950.

10—Citations and Bronze plaque by the Iloilo Press Club for destruction of Huk Forces and capture of Guillermo Capadocia in 1951-1952.

11—Citations and Silver Plaque by the Governor of Iloilo, Capiz and Antique for restoring normalcy, peace and order in Panay and for saving of democracy against Communism in 1951-1952. t

12—Commendations by Secretary of National Defense, Honorable Ramon Magsaysay for achieving decisive results as Pagan Sector Commander against the Huks in Pangasinan in 1952-1953.

13—Commendation of Lt. General Jesus Vargas, Chief of Staff for keeping the 1953 Elections free, clean, fair and orderly, as commanding general of the second military area.

14—Medal for outstanding services by the Reserve Officers' Legion of the Philippines (ROLP) on May 16, 1957.

15—Long Service Medal after completion of 20 years service.

16—Philippine Defense Medal and Ribbon with one Bronze Star, World War II.

17—Asiatic-Pacific War Theater Medal and Ribbon with one Bronze Star World War II.

18—American Defense Service Medal and Ribbon with one Bronze Star World War II.

19—Distinguished Unit Badge with two Oak-Leaf Clusters, World War II.

20—Presidential Citation Unit Badge, World War II.

21—Victory Medal, World War II.

22—Combat Infantryman's Badge, World War II.

General Santos is also well known for his inspiring talks and speeches * to his officers and men during storms and stress while in military campaigns, and his oratorical and rhetorical speeches on national holidays or in any other affairs where he is called upon to speak.

He is a soldier with the astuteness of the Great Napoleon, the placidity of George Washington, the ferocity of Alexander the Great, and above all the great intellectual mind of his commanding general of the last war, General Douglas MacArthur.

---

* Appendix: Speech of assumption of office as Chief of Staff.

Appendix

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEECH DELIVERED BY LT. GENERAL ALFREDO M. SANTOS DURING HIS ASSUMPTION OF COMMAND AS CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINES, ON 1 SEPTEMBER 1962, AT CAMP MURPHY, QUEZON CITY.

President and Mrs. Macapagal, Vice President Pelaez, Secretary Peralta, General Cruz, your Excellencies, members of both Houses of Congress, distinguished guests, officers, Corps of Cadets, enlisted men and civilian employees of the Armed Forces, ladies and gentlemen, my friends, all:

On this momentous occasion on assuming command of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, as the 11th Chief of Staff, the crowning glory of my almost 27 years of active military service, I raise my eyes and lift my heart to Almighty God and thank Him most fervently for this "manna" from heaven which He showered upon me, His humble servant and insignificant mortal. I would like also to express and acknowledge publicly from the bottom of a full heart my deep gratitude for and appreciation of the great honor and trust and confidence reposed upon me by our beloved Commander-in-Chief, President Diosdado Macapagal and our Secretary of National Defense, The Honorable Macario Peralta, Jr. To a professional soldier like me who has been devoting the best years of his life in honest, loyal and dedicated service, in peace and in war, to our beloved country and people, this is truly the highest award. And so as I stand here this morning, having been appointed to this exalted position as Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines on the basis of seniority, merit, and justice, our beloved President, President Macapagal has not only honored his plighted word and beautifully implemented his announced policy, but he has also infused renewed hope and vigor into the hearts of thousands in the Armed Forces and has immeasurably strengthened the faith and confidence of millions of our countrymen, in his sincerity and high mindedness and his righteousness and dedication to the cause of good government.

Mr. President, as our Chosen Leader by the sovereign will of our people, I pledge to you down deep in my heart that the Armed Forces of the Philippines under my leadership will rally to you, is four square behind you and will follow you to the ends of the earth in your noble quest for the Holy Grail of happiness and contentment, peace and prosperity, strength and security, for 28 million Filipinos who inhabit this beautiful Isles, the Pearl of the Orient Seas, the land of our birth. To the legion of loyal and faithful friends, inside and outside the the military service, to the scores of veterans organizations, civic associations and respectable groups of citizens, Filipinos and foreigners, known or unknown to me, who prayed for me, stood by me, and believed in me during the many tempestuous crises and buffetings of my military service, go a million thanks for their abiding faith, constant encouragement and unwavering support.

As Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, I believe these—these are my guide posts:

1. Full acceptance and implementation of the principle of civilian supremacy over the military by legally constituted authorities.

2. Wholehearted support of President Macapagal's crusade to eradicate graft and corruption in this country, particularly in the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

3. Wholehearted support of President Macapagal's Socio-Economic Program with the end in view of making this beloved Philippines a happier, a greater and a stronger country.

4. Wholehearted support of President Macapagal's New National Orientation and Moral Regeneration Program, to enhance the well-being and dignity of and respect for the Filipino; and to uphold, at all times, the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines.

5. Greater and continuous impetus to the full-scale development of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, both regular and reserve, along modern tactics, techniques and material, adding emphasis on the high quality of leadership and professionalism; of morale and efficiency, of loyalty and discipline so that this organization will be a reliable and effective armed might of the Republic in its long and arduous task of nation building.

6. And the last, greater and continuous effort to improve the lot and ameliorate the living conditions of our military and civilian personnel, particularly those of the enlisted men and their families, to insure at all times a healthy and vigorous, loyal and alert body of fighting men who will be willing to lay down their lives if need be, in the performance of their duties as soldiers of the Republic.

In the days of old, soldiers were given the highest premium in society. Today, too, soldiers should take their proper place in the society of men for if crisis comes, the Philippines will always depend on the loyalty of the soldiers of the Republic. For if the Officers Corps represents the brains of the organization, the enlisted and civilian personnel represent the body and sinews. A brilliant mind in a sickly and emaciated body cannot function efficiently and effectively. In ancient times, when a Roman general, flushed with military victory against the enemy of the state, entered the gates of the City of Rome to receive the plaudits of his people, he had with him in his chariot standing by his side a slave, whispering repeatedly into his ears the following words: "Remember thou art only human. Thou art not God." In this spirit, therefore, of deep humility and sense of great responsibility, I enter upon my duties as Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. On bended knees in humble supplications to Divine Providence, the Almighty God who sees the hearts of men and guides the destinies of nations, I pray for wisdom and courage, for strength and vision, with malice towards none, with charity and justice for all, I, therefore, enjoin all the officers, enlisted men and civilian employees under my command to help me and cooperate with me loyally and faithfully to the greater glory and honor of the Armed Forces of the Philippines; to do their allotted tasks with missionary zeal, placing the interest and well-being of the Filipino people and the Philippines above anything else. To the loyal, the honest, the sincere, the efficient, the hardworking, there is the extreme satisfaction and divine happiness of duty well done, of life worth living, of a cause worth fighting and dying for.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Philippines, particularly the Armed Forces of the Philippines, needs today and at all times:

"Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and willing hands.
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;

Men who have opinions and a will;
Men who have honor;
Men who will not lie;
Men who will stand before a demagogue and dawn his treacherous flatterings.
Tall men, sun-crowned who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking."

Mr. President, as our Commander-in-Chief, I am at your command. "Mine is not to question why, mine is but to do or die."

JAPANESE FILIPINIANA

By Josefa M. Saniel
Assistant Professor of History
University of the Philippines

The author presents the results of her research in Japan on Japanese Filipiniana, which reveals the late nineteenth-century Japanese nationalists' aspirations for expansion to the Philippines.

Exhibited among the Rizaliana in Manila during last year's Rizal Centennial celebration was Hanano Tomizō's *Jose Rizal den* (Biography of Jose Rizal).[1] This volume was among those published by busy Japanese publishing houses to meet a war-time demand for information about territories in Nanyō (the "Southern Seas") occupied by the Imperial Japanese forces. Works such as *Suganuma Teifu* by Akanuma Saburo,[2] *Firipin* by Nakajima Soichi,[3] *Nanyo Nihonjin Machi no Kenkyu* by Iwao Seichi,[4] the two volumes written by Irie Toraji and published by the same publisher[5]—*Hojin Kaigai Hattenshi* (Development of the Japanese Abroad)[6] and the *Meiji Nanshin Shiko* (History of Japanese Expansion to the Southern Seas)[7] as well as Kimura Ki's *Minami no Shinju* (Pearl of the South)[8] and *Nunobiki Maru*[9]—all these were among Japanese publications of the last Pacific war which fully or partly cover the Philippines. They constitute part of Japanese Filipiniana—that is, documents, books, journals, newspapers, and other sources which touch on the Philippines, written in Japanese, and available in Japan.

New data uncovered not long ago in Japan on late-nineteenth-century Philippines have enlarged the factual base upon which the aforementioned period of Philippine history can be interpreted, more specifically, the relations between Japan and the Philippines about which no study was made until recently. These data were drawn from unpublished and published official documents, published contemporary accounts written by Japanese who visited the Islands during the period, and from other primary and secondary sources on the Philippines.

---

[1] Tōkyō: Nishimura Shoten, 1942.

[2] Tōkyō: Hakubunkan, 1941.

[3] Tōkyō: Keiō Shobō, 1942.

[4] Tōkyō: Chijin Shokan, 1941. The part on the Japanese towns in the Philippines was translated into English and published under the title, *Early Japanese Settlers in the Philippines* (Tōkyō: The Foreign Office Association of Japan, 1943).

[5] Tōkyō: Idashoten.

[6] 1942.

[7] 1943.

[8] Ōsaka: Zenkoku Shōbō, 1942.

[9] Tōkyō: Shumyōdō, 1944.

The process of discovering Japanese records on the Philippines in the Japanese institutional depositories, in private libraries and in Tōkyō's second-hand book stores was challenging, fascinating and, indeed, rewarding. Not certain whether such Filipiniana did exist but hoping that they did exist somewhere in Japan, I flew into Tōkyō in September, 1959 on a year's research grant form the Rockefeller Foundation to work on the problem of Japanese-Philippine relations from 1868-1898.

The scarcity of bibliographic aids had compelled me to depend in large portion on oral information from Japanese, American, and Filipino scholars and friends who guided me to pertinent records which in turn led to additional sources or to informants who could clarify problems that the search disclosed.

My opportunity to use the catalog of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Diplomatic Section (Gaikōbunshoshitsu) led to the discovery of pertinent records shelved unused in the archive's storeroom. Until the last war, all these documents were considered classified and, even today, they can be used only with special permission. Other depositories in Tōkyō containing Filipiniana are: the Diet Library, the main library of Tōkyō University and the Meiji Bunko which is the University's depository of newspapers, journals, magazines, and other publications of the Meiji period (1868-1912).

It has been truly rewarding, therefore, this quest for Japanese Filipiniana which yielded somehow various facets of the late-nineteenth century Japanese nationalist activists' desire to extend Japanese control over the Philippines.

Inspired by a sense of urgency that, should Spanish rule collapse, the Japanese flag—not any other's—be raised in the Philippines. The Nationalists' interest for expansion to the Philippines was argued by Nationalist writers in terms of the need for trade expansion which entailed the need for immigration. Japanese southern advance to the Philippines was also argued in terms of the need for defending Japan's southern frontiers, which had extended to the Ryūkyūs in the 1870's and to Formosa (now Taiwan) in the mid-1890's, which invariably argued for Japan's mission to help Filipinos emancipate themselves from Spanish tyranny.

How tellingly the number of available evidences indicate the Japanese need for expansion—to the island colony of Spain—for purposes of trade and necessarily for immigration.

Consider the "Firipin Guntō Kikō" (Travels in the Philippines) which we find recounted by Takatsu Gorō in the *Chigaku Kyokai Hokoku.*[10] Takatsu Gorō had been in the Philippines for two years (ca. May, 1887—May, 1889), and his rather attractive description of the physical-cultural geography of the Philippines embellishes his account of his travels in that country so rich in natural resources and possessing a potential market for Japanese industrial products. So close too to the Ryūkyūs, "so close a neighbor country that we could cross to it by means of a piece of board,"[11] Takatsu Gorō intimates. And there need be no fear on the part of the Japanese to immigrate to the Philippines for they can share in the profits of trade which the Chinese, the Europeans, and the Americans were enjoying.[12] In fact, if it had not been for Japan's isolation policy which suspended earlier prosperous trade relations with the Philippines, the latter could have long ago developed properly into a market for Japanese goods.[13] Takatsu Gorō thus makes bold his bid for Japanese expansion.

An equally bold bid for Japanese evpansion to the Philippines is indicated in "Manira Keisei no Ippan" (On the Present Condition in Manila) by Yatabe Umekichi, first Japanese consul in Manila. Describing in more detail the products of the Philippines, Yatabe Umekichi's article published in the Chigaku Kyōkai Hōkoku[14] emphasizes the fact that these products are raw materials which could be exchanged with Japan's manufactured goods, such as textiles.[15] To increase trade, Yatabe Umekichi proposes the opening of a direct shipping route between Japan and the Philippines. Undoubtedly the proposal is intended to convert Manila into one of Japan's leading markets. The proposed route would facilitate Japan's importation and reduce the cost of Philippine abaca, sugar, and tobacco which would undersell those raised in Japan.[16] And because of the need for cultivators and laborers in the Islands, Yatabe Umekichi encourages his countrymen to settle in the Philippines.[17]

---

[10] Takatsu Gorō, "Firipin Guntō Kikō" (Travels in the Philippines), *Chigaku Kyōkai Hōkoku,* XI, No. 8 (November, 1889), 3-21.

[11] *Ibid.,* 4.

[12] *Ibid.,* 9-10.

[13] *Ibid.,* 4-5.

[14] Yatabe Umkichi, "Manira Keisei no Ippan" (On the Present Condition in Manila), *Chigaku Kyōkai Hokoku,* XII, Nos. 3-4 (June-July, 1890), 3-11; No. 5 (August, 1890), 3-9; No. 6 (September, 1890), 3-24; No. 7 (October, 1890), 47-53.

[15] *Ibid.,* No. 6 (September, 1890), 5.

More evidence comes from Chikuin Shōji (pen name of Mabuchi) who accompanied Consul Yatabe Umekichi to Manila in 1889. Interesting details he supplies us in his "Report from Manila" ("Manira tsushin") serialized in *Nippon.*[18] Persuading his countrymen to immigrate to and trade with the Philippines, Chikuin Shōji inveigles potential Japanese immigrants with a vignette of the half-caste women of the Philippines: ". . . even I who am unfamiliar with women, have been, at times, quite charmed by them. I have not seen many women as beautiful as they are." Before the traders are dangled these words of encouragement: "All Spaniards hate foreign businessmen but like the Japanese."[19]

Five reasons for Japanese immigration are set forth by Tengai Kishi (pen name of Koshimaru Shigeru) in an article, "Nippon Shojumin Ron" (Discussion of Japanese immigration) contributed to the *Tokyo Keizai Zasshi.*[20] To Tengai Kishi, the best way to increase a nation's wealth is through immigration. After discussing the reasons for immigration, and analyzing the disadvantages of sending immigrants to various proposed areas, he concludes that the best place for the Japanese to move into was the Philippines. That the Philippines is strategically located as a focus of trade routes in the South Seas as well as in the East makes it a convenient center of trade routes which connect to Yokohama, to Hong Kong, to Singapore, to Australia, to Taiwan, to Annam, to America, and then to the South Sea Island.[21] Tengai Kishi suggests that the extensive Cagayan valley or the area long Lake Bai would be ideal for Japanese settlements. From these places the Japanese could move to other parts of the Islands. Tengai Kishi supports the idea of moving a number of his countrymen to the Philippine labor market thinking that Japan should depend on the "poor Japanese" who are willing to emigrate and who are adventurous because they were impoverished.[22]

---

[16] *Ibid.,* No. 7 (October, 1890), 51.

[17] *Ibid.,* No. 5 (August, 1890), 14.

[18] The article was published in nine installments in the *Nippon,* from February 20, 1889 to March 20, 1889.

[19] *Ibid.,* March 20, 1889, 1.

[20] The article was published in two installments: (1) No. 546 (November 8, 1890), 652-655; (2) No. 548 (November 22, 1890), 733-738.

[21] Tengai Kishi (Koshimaru Shigeru), "Nippon Shojimin Ron" (Discussion of Japanese Immigration), *Tōkyō Keizai Zasahi,* No. 548 (November 22, 1890), 733-738.

[22] *Ibid.,* 737.

Two years later (1892), "Firipin Guntō ni Tsuite Supein-Koku to Tokuyaku-o Musububeshi" (Conclude a Treaty with Spain Regarding the Philippines), published in the *Nihonjin*[23] without a byline corroborates Tengai Kishi's belief that the Philippines would be the best place for Japanese settlements. Like Suganuma Teifu, the unidentified writer considers Mindanao and Paragua (now Palawan) ideal for Japanese immigrants to move into. Commenting that in the Philippines, unlike Australia and South America, the Japanese could be easily assimilated into the native population of the Islands, that the rich islands of the Philippines are conveniently close to Japan, and that furthermore, the archipelago had traded with Japan in the past, the writer ends the discussion by proposing that Spain conclude a defensive treaty with Japan in order to protect the Philippines from foreign powers.[24]

In the face of threats from the Foreign Powers who were extending their control over the islands in the South Seas, Tonan Koji (pen name of Hattori Toru), in his study entitled *Nanyo Saku* (A Policy for the South Seas),[25] advocates Japanese expansion to the Philippines through trade. Not only would this policy be the best but also the most peaceful.[26] Tonan Koji, however, warns the Japanese traders against exporting inferior goods to Luzon because the Filipinos were more civilized than the natives of the other islands in the South Seas, inasmuch as they had been under Spain for some time and had contact with other Europeans.[27] At the rate the population of Japan was increasing, despite successful immigration to Hokkaido, the latter island would be full within twenty years, says Tonan Koji. Japanese immigrants should thus move to the Philippines.

The "Firipin Guntō no Okeru Shinajin Oyobi Nihonjin" (The Chinese and Japanese in the Philippine Islands), by Sano Tsuneki, published in the *Tokyo Chigaku Hokoku*[28] indicates that the Philippines is not only strategically located vis-a-vis trade with Japan, China, Australia, and America, but that its position as the focus of Asian commerce would be enhanced after the construction of the

---

[23] No. 39 (May 16, 1892), 2-4.

[24] Unsigned "Firipin Guntō ni Tsuite Supein-Koku to Hokuyaku-o Musububeshi" (Conclude a Treaty with Spain Regarding the Philippines), *Nihonjin*, No. 39 (May 16, 1892), 2-3.

[25] (Tōkyō: Sanseido, 1891).

[26] Tonan Koji (Hattori Tōru), *Nanyō Saku* (The Policy for the South Seas). (Tōkyō: Sanseido, 1891).

[27] *Ibid.*, 44.

[28] XIII, No. 89 (November-December, 1891), 41-56.

Nicaraguan canal[29] and the Russian trans-Siberian railway.[30] The article describes the great amount of uncultivated land in the Philippines which had remained undeveloped because of the scarcity of population. The author concludes: "If the Japanese would move to the Philippine Islands with as dauntless a spirit as had the Chinese, it would be easy for them to acquire some advantages there."[31]

In another two years, another contribution to the *Shokumin Kyokai Hokoku* reports findings in the Philippines. Sano Tsuneki in his "Firipin Guntō Shisatsu Hōkokusho" (The report on the Philippines to the Japanese Government)[32] picks out Philippine sites suitable for Japanese habitation. They are Isabela and Cagayan, where the leading tobacco company in the Philippines needed cultivators and the company was dissatisfied with its Filipino workers. Sano Tsuneki also suggests moving Japanese agricultural settlers into Paragua, and these settlers are to colonize this rich island so sparsely inhabited by natives, most of whom are uncivilized.[33] Besides, Spanish colonial control over the Island is weak.[34]

By 1895, the Sino-Japanese war was settled. Reports published in that year reveal immense Japanese interest in the Filipino attitude toward Japan. This concern seems to imply the goading urge to expand to the Philippines in the wake of the Sino-Japanese war. One of these reports was given by Sugino Sōtarō, who had stayed in the Spanish colony for two and half years and was requested by of the *Tokyo Chigaku Kyokai* to answer their inquiries about the Philippines.[35] The questions and answers were published in the association's journal under the title "Firipin Guntō Tanken Jikkyō" (The Real Condition in the Philippines as Observed in a Survey Trip).[36] Another report without a by-line and entitled "Manira-ni Okeru Nihonjin no Kinkyō" (Current Conditions of Japanese in Manila),[37] was published in the *Shokunin Kyokai Hokoku.*

---

[29] The United States eventually built the Panama Canal instead.

[30] "Firipin Guntō no Okeru Shonajin Oyobi Nihonjin" (Chinese and Japanese in the Philippine Islands), *Tōkyō Chigaku Kyōkai Hōkoku,* 111, No. 89 (November-December, 1891), 52.

[31] *Ibid.,* 56.

[32] No. 1 (1893), 3-24; No. 2 (1893), 1-48.

[33] "Firipin Guntō Shikatsu Hōkokusho" (The Report on the Philippines to the Japanese Government), *Shokumin Kyōkai Hōkoku,* No. 1 (1893), 50-52.

[34] *Ibid.,* 56-62.

[35] See *Tōkyō Chigaku Kyōkai Hōkoku, XVII,* No. 1 (April-June, 1895), 111-136.

[36] No. 30 (1895), 77-78.

[37] See unsigned document, "Manira ni Okeru Nihonjin no Kinkyō" (Current Condition of Japanese in Manila), *Shōkumin Kyokai Hōkoku,* No. 30 (1895), 77-78. See also Sugino Sōtarō, "Firipin Gunto Tanken Jikkyō" (The Real Condition in the Philippines as Observed in a Survey Trip), XVII, No. 1 (April-June, 1895), 115-116.

Both reports agree that—especially after Japan's impressive victory over the Chinese—Filipino feeling towards the Japanese was salutary indeed.

The second set of viewpoints reinforced the preceding arguments for Japanese expansion with arguments for expansion as a means of self-defense and as a means of civilizing and aiding fellow Asians, particularly those draining the cup of Western tyranny to the dregs, or those threatened by the expansive movement of Western Powers.

Fukumoto Nichinan's "Nihon to Nanyō" [38] contends that the impotence of Spain in the Philippines poses a menace too alarming for Japan to ignore. To safeguard itself Japan has to gain control of the Islands if only to ward off the Germans who are just waiting for the kill. To ward off the Germans is to render secure Japan's southern boundary, the Ryūkyūs. This apparently is an expansion of the idea earlier expressed by Fukumoto Nichinan's friend, Suganuma Teifu.[39] And where Fukumoto feared German expansion to the Philippines, Sano Tsuneki, in 1891, expressed his apprehension over Great Britain's possible expansion to the Philippines which "is the best place for England to expand in the Pacific because she has a great ambition of connecting Hongkong, Singapore, Australia, and Canada."[40]

The nature of Spanish impotence as an argument for Japan's mission to civilize and/or aid the Filipinos lays open the exposes on the inefficacious administrative supervision and inadequate military control of the Spanish colonial government in the Philippines. Typical exposès were two unsigned articles. One was "Firipin Guntō Genkyō" (Report from the Philippines), serialized in the *Nippon*[41] in 1889. Another was "Firipin Rettō, Meiji 26" (The State of affairs in the Philippines, Meiji 26, [1893], published in the *Toho Kyokai Hokoku.*[42] The former unconceals the usual corruption and inefficiency of colonial officials, and among other things, the conflict between church and state, the natural disasters prone to lay waste the Islands, the Filipino dissatisfaction with the Spanish colonial administrators in the Philippines. The latter article discloses similar facts but adds bits of information equally significant. The internal troubles of the Spanish colonial government in Mindanao and the government neglect of natural resources lend added significance indeed to "Firipin Rettō, Meiji 26", the latter article.

---

[38] *Nihonjin,* No. 44 (April 3, 1890), 9-12; No. 45 (April 18, 1890), 21-23; No. 46 (May 3, 1890); No. 47 (May 18, 1890), 6-10.

[39] "Manira Tsūshin," *Nippon,* July 30, 1889, 3; August 22, 1889, 1; August 27, 1889, 3.

[40] "Firipin Guntō no Okeru Shinajin...," *op. cit.,* 56.

[41] April 7, 1889, 1; April 13, 1889, 1; April 20, 1889, 1.

[42] No. 35 (1894), 77-83.

More significant becomes Chikuin Shōji's remarks like, "They [the Filipinos] are not interested in clothes, food or houses. As this country is underdeveloped, the Japanese should take the lead in developing it."[43] What better evidence of altruism can we find, except that we are ever aware of Japan's "surplus population" and that these writers who sought to justify Japan's expansion to the Philippines undoubtedly conceived of Japanese emigrant settlers who would—at the most opportune time and with the aid of course of the long-suffering Filipinos—eventually dislodge the Spaniards.

Even more significant—not amusing at all—is the expansionist idea that develops kinship ties between the Japanese and Filipinos. Could this idea have been aimed at making the Japanese feel obliged to help the Filipinos not because the Filipinos were backward, not because the Filipinos were victims of tyranny, but because the Filipinos were kins? Surely we could not disregard the attempts to define the ties binding Japanese and Filipinos in terms of past contacts between Filipinos and early Japanese traders and/or settlers in the Philippines,[44] or the similarities of physical characteristics[45] or similarities of material objects used by Filipinos to those used by Japanese (such as the swords of the *Moros* in Jolo and Mindanao)![46]

Among the arguments for expansionism—now by no means impalpable—is the idea that the Japanese find the Filipinos in need of succor to overthrow the Spanish colonial government. This idea is most forcefully concretized in Suehiro Tetchō's novel, *Nanyo no Daiharan* (The Severe Disturbance [lit., Great Waves] in the South Seas).[47] It was written about 1890, a year after the author had returned from his trip abroad.[48] Suehiro Tetchō (pen name of Suehiro Jūgo, 1849-1896), was one of the most representative and popular of the Japanese political novelists of the early Meiji period.[49] *Setchubai* (Plum Blossoms in the Snow), one of the well known political novels of the 1880's supported the nationalists' clamor for the promulgation of a constitution and the opening of a parliament. However, after the grant of the constitution in 1889 and the convention of the Diet in 1890, Suehiro Tetchō, like some of his fellow political novelists, concentrated on Japanese expansion, which he thought, his country needed to undertake with earnestness.

---

[43] *Nippon*, February 17, 1889, 1.

[44] See (1) Fukumoto Nichinan, "Kōrai Roku" (Incoming Communications), *Nippon*, November 9, 1889, 3; November 23, 1889 1, (2) Fukumoto Nichinan, "Firipin-Shi" (History of the Philippines, *Tōhō Kyōkai Hōkoku*, No. 2 (1891), 40-50; (3) Unsigned article, "Firipin Gunto ni Tsuite Supein-Koku to Tokuyaku-o Musububeshi," *Nihonjin*, No. 39 (May 16, 1892), 3.

[45] See (1) Suganuma Teifu, "Manira Tsushin" *Nippon*, July 31, 1889, 1; August 3, 1889, 1; (2) Fukumoto Nichinan, "Korei Roku" *Nippon*, November 7, 1889, 3; November 8, 1889, 3.

[46] Fukumoto Nichinan, *Ibid.*, November 9, 1889, 3.

[47] (Tōkyō: Sumyodo, 1891). After *Nanyō no Daiharan*, Suehiro Tetchō wrote two other political novels dealing with the Philippines. They are: (1) *Arashi no Nagori* (The Aftermath of Storm) which is a sequel of the first novel; (2) *Oumabara* (Ocean lit., *A* vast Expanse of Water.) See Yanagida Izumi, "Suehiro Tetcho Kenkyu" (A Study of Suehiro Tetchō), II, *Seijishosetsu Kenkyu* (Tōkyō: Shunjusha, 1935), 584-589).

Copies of the last two political novels were not available during the author's sojourn of one year in Japan, therefore, only the first novel is considered.

[48] Suehiro was away from April 13, 1888 to February 11, 1889. And *Nanyō no Daiharan* was published in 1890.

Japanese expansion to the Philippines is the positive concern of Suehiro Tetchō in *Nanyo no Daiharan.* The work is not unlike his other novels which he himself described as "nothing but . . . political tract[s] sprinkled with novel powder."[50] Suehiro Tetchō's *Nanyo no Daiharan* is a significant Japanese Filipiniana not only in its exposure—in the form of fiction—of the Japanese nationalist activists' aspirations for Japanese expansion to the Philippines but also because it limns the interaction of ideas between two nationalists working for dissimilar goals in their respective countries: Suehiro Tetchō, for Japanese expansion; Jose Rizal, for needed reform in the Philippines. Suehiro Tetchō met Jose Rizal (whom he mistook for a Japanese) aboard the English ship, *Belgic,* which left Yokohama for San Francisco on April 13, 1888. Because Suehiro Tetchō did not speak English well enough, and because Rizal had learned Japanese during his short sojourn in Japan and could express himself in English, it seems that he became a constant companion of Suehiro Tetchō, acting as the latter's interpreter. In his introduction to the *Nanyo no Daiharan,* Suehiro Tetchō remarks, ". . . I met a gentleman from Manila . . . he has been working for Philippine independence . . . but he was arrested as a political offender and he escaped abroad. He talked to me about the policy of the Spanish government and the restless condition in the Islands. One day, I saw a picture of a beautiful lady and he told me that she was his sweetheart but because she was separated from the gentleman, she entered a convent. I was deeply impressed by their affair so that I decided to write a political novel by expanding his story . . . Some of the incidents are fictitious . . . and I have written about what I had long been dissatisfied . . ."[51]

---

[49] H. Borton, *Japan's Modern Century* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1955), 185-186.

[50] Quoted in G. Samson, *The Western World and Japan* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958), 415.

[51] See (1) "Suehiro Jūgō Tsushin, dai ikkai" (First Report of Suehiro Jūgō *Choya Shimbun,* May 22, 1888, 1; (2) Suehiro Tetchō, *Oshi no Ryōkō* (Travels of a Dumb

Such was Jose Rizal's influence on Suehiro Tetchō, who was one of the exponents for Japanese expansion to the Philippines and who contributed other volumes to Japanese Filipiniana.[52]

Thus have we partly assessed the contribution of Japanese Filipiniana to the study of late-nineteenth century Japanese nationalists' aspirations for Japanese expansion to the Philippines. Partly, we say, for there are still other Japanese Filipiniana awaiting the quest of "the passionate few" among our historians.

Person), Tokyo: Aoki Kosundo, 1900), 5-6; (3) Yanagida Izumi, Suehiro Tetchō Kenkyu ...*op. cit.*, 589. See also Suehiro Tetchō, *Nanyō no Daiharan*, op. cit., i-iii. Translated from the original in Japanese.

[52] See note 47.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF RAFAEL PALMA

by José V. Tacal, Jr.

A candid evaluation of a great Filipino intellectual and patriot, whose success in life failed to despoil him of his modesty and sincerity.

On December 17, 1938, at the ripe age of 64 years, Rafael Palma received on the occasion of the conferral upon him of the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa,* from the University of the Philippines, the highest institution of higher learning in this country, the following citation:

> "Rafael Palma, man of letters, historian, philosopher, journalist, educator, statesman, and patriot, product of the Old Generation yet so affectionately claimed by the New, handing into the present the heritage of the past, serving the country under three regimes in whom the State University which he guided for ten years, is indebted for having so immeasurably enriched it."[1]

Thus, in this one short paragraph was epitomized the life of one of the greatest Filipinos to have graced the pages of our history —"a man of character and integrity and firmness of convictions, and a sincere nationalist in politics and education . . . . a true and inspiring leader of our people" and who, "in these days of moral relaxation and disintegration . . . . should be a source of inspiration and thought to all Filipinos."[2]

Of him, Salvador P. Lopez, formerly Philippine Ambassador to France and now Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, wrote some years back: "Of other men you can say that they are the idols of the populace, that they are peerless yell-binders, that their personalities are magnetic, that they have a personal charm that is irresistible. Of Rafael Palma, you can say not that he entirely lacks the qualities of a popular idol, but that he is a man of principles and you feel certain that in that affirmation you have sized him up for all times and indicated the principal virtue for which posterity may well remember him.

---

[1] Virginia Palma-Bonifacio, "Father and the Days With Him," *The Phil. Ed. Forum,* III, 3 (Third Quarter, 1952) p. 21.

[2] "Rafael Palma" (Editorial), *The Phil. Jour. of Education,* XXVII, 3 (September, 1948) p. 132.

"For Rafael Palma belongs to that type of men whom their most violent enemies will honor in private because they are men of mettle, men who cannot be swayed by mercenary temptations from a point of view honestly arrived at, men who cannot be bought . . ."[3]

With the resurgence of Philippine nationalism, it is but fitting that we recall to mind one of its greatest pillars, a man who was molded with the same stuff of which Rizal and other Filipino heroes were made; "a national hero," in the words of Judge Guillermo Guevara, "who did not seek to profit materially from his nationalism."[4]

Rafael Palma, whose life spanned a period of six and one-half decades, lived through some of the most exciting eras in our national history from the latter part of the decadent Spanish rule to the Commonwealth years. In spite of this, however, he did not live long enough to see his country get its freedom for which he had worked so hard.

His Early Years

Born of humble parents from a middle class family on October 24, 1874, in Tondo, Manila, Rafael Palma was the third of four children.[5] His father, Hermogenes Palma, whom he recalled as a patriotic and a nationalistic man, was an employee of the *Contaduria de Hacienda,* the equivalent during the Spanish regime of the General Auditing Office of today. While his mother, who died when he was only seven years of age, was Hilaria Vicente Velasquez.[6]

Rafael Palma obtained his early education by entering the public school then called *Escuela Municipal de Tondo,* in June, 1882. Three years after, in June, 1885, after passing the entrance examinations, he transferred to the *Ateneo Municipal* from where he graduated in 1891 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. He also finished a short commercial course in this school in 1894. As an Ateneo student, he did not show much intellectual prowess not because he had none but that, as he confessed later, he was not interested in obtaining high grades.[7]

---

[3] Salvador P. Lopez, "Fifty Years of Philippine Journalism," *Filipiniana Reference Shelf,* I, 5 (April, 1941) pp. 92-93.

[4] *The Daily Mirror,* October 29, 1951.

[5] Products of his father's first marriage. There were three boys and one girl. The youngest was José (Pepe) Palma, distinguished poet in Spanish and more popularly known as the author of the lyrics of the Philippine National Anthem.

[6] Rafael Palma, *My Autobiography,* Translated from the Spanish original by Alicia Palma-Bautista. Manila: Capitol Publishing House, Inc., 1953, p. 7.

[7] Palma, *op. cit.,* p. 21.

From 1891 to 1897, he was enrolled in the law course at the University of Santo Tomás, but on account of the outbreak of the second phase of the Philippine Revolution the following year when he was due to graduate, he was unable to secure a law diploma as the University closed.

The Young Revolutionary

With the renewal of the revolution that finally toppled the tyrannical Spanish government in the Islands following the failure of the Pact of Biak-na-bato, Rafael Palma, who, by this time, had imbibed the ideas of liberalism,[8] joined the revolutionary movement as a reporter in *La Independencia,* the first Filipino daily newspaper, whose founder and first director was General Antonio Luna. Other members of the staff included such literary greats (in Spanish) as Fernando Ma. Guerrero, Cecilio Apostol, Jose Palma, Epifanio de los Santos, Rosa Sevilla, Clemente Zulueta, and others. The paper came out with its first issue on September 3, 1898 and, as a consequence of its high patriotic ideals, soon became the "most potent newspaper of the period."[9]

As a staff-writer of *La Independencia,* with which he "spent the happiest days" of his life,[10] Rafael Palma signed his articles as *Hapon, Dapit Hapon,* Robert Paul, and R. P. Villa.[11]

At first *La Independencia* was printed in General Luna's house in Binondo, Manila, but with the outbreak of the Philippine-American War in February, 1899, and the subsequent advance of the American troops towards the revolutionary capital of Malolos, its printing press was installed on a railroad coach and soon assumed an ambulatory nature. After the treacherous assassination of General Luna and his aide-de-camp, Colonel Francisco (Paco) Roman[12] on June 5, 1899 at Kabanatuan, Palma assumed the paper's editorship and continued as such until due to the pressure borne upon them by the pursuing American soldiers, it was no longer possible to keep up with its publication. With Malolos already in enemy control and General Emilio Aguinaldo in full flight, the staff of *La Independencia* buried the printing press under the ground a little distance from the Bautista (Pangasinan) Railway Station[13] and then these brave men disbanded. Palma and two companions fled to Camiling, Tarlac, and there they put out the last two issues of the newspaper in a "miniature form—a living picture of the unhappy state into which we had been reduced."[14] When the town finally fell to the Americans, *La Independencia* definitely ceased publication.

---

[8] As a student in the Ateneo and the University of Santo Tomás, Rafael Palma did not only have pro-Spanish leanings but also wrote propaganda materials for the Roman Catholic Church. With the resumption of hostilities against Spain, however, his patriotic feelings were aroused that he eventually became a disciple of the principles of the French Revolution.

[9] Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic,* Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960, p. 268.

[10] Palma, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[11] In those days, as it was during the period preceding World War II, it was customary for any Filipino writer of note to have a pseudonym. Hence, Palma's several pen-names.

[12] Rafael Palma's first cousin.

Palma in Cebu

With the defeat of the badly-organized, demoralized, and ill-equipped Philippine Revolutionary army by the superior-armed, well-fed, and well-disciplined American forces under Otis already a *fait accompli,* Rafael Palma returned to Manila where he did some writing for *La Patria* and other papers published in the city at the time. Subsequently, he was persuaded by another young revolutionary, Sergio Osmeña, to go with the latter to his native Cebu and with Jaime de Veyra, the three founded in February, 1900, the first daily newspaper in that province, *El Nuevo Dia.* As co-editor of the paper, Palma stayed on the job from April (when the actual operation of the daily started) up to December of that year at which time he returned to Manila, whereupon, he decided to take the bar examinations scheduled in August, 1901.

The Birth of El Renacimiento

While reviewing, however, he toyed with the idea of putting out a newspaper so that after passing the bar that same year, instead of going into the practice of his profession, he collected money and founded *El Renacimiento,* a daily newspaper, "to give expression to the people's aspirations, and to show the Americans that the ideal of independence was still alive in the hearts of the people."[15] With Palma as its first editor, this newspaper which easily became the most popular and well-known at the time and dubbed as the "Champion of Filipino Nationalism," put out its first issue on September 3, 1901. His stint with the newspaper which lasted for about a year and a half, was cut short by his marriage on February 1, 1902, to Carolina Ocampo, one of the daughters of the newspaper's administrator.[16] Now with a family, he found it hard to subsist on only fifty pesos a month salary which was the same as those of the other members of the staff. He, therefore, quit in 1903 and went to law practice.[17] Palma at this time also taught at the *Escuela de Derecho* in Manila.

---

[13] Palma, *op. cit.,* p. 36.

[14] *Ibid.,* pp. 36-37.

[15] Rafael Corpuz, "Rafael Palma," Translated from the Spanish original by Paz Marquez Benitez, *Philippine Journal of Education,* XXVII, 4 (October, 1948) p. 201.

[16] Palma, *op. cit.,* p. 44. His marriage was blessed with eight children, four boys and an equal number of girls. However, only four are surviving: Virginia, Hector, Alicia, and Fe. *Op. cit.,* p. 14.

Palma Enters Politics

In 1907, he transferred his residence to Cavite and in recognition of his and Juan Sumulong's earlier defense in *El Renacimiento* of the Caviteños against the abuses of certain officers of the Philippine Constabulary, he was elected in August of that year as the province's representative to the First Philippine Assembly which was inaugurated on October 16, 1907 in the presence of the then U.S. Secretary of War (later U.S. President) William Howard Taft. His term as an assemblyman was, however, brief because in June, 1909, he was appointed by Governor-General James A. Smith to the second Philippine Commission—the youngest member of that body, but the poorest pecuniarily and of the most humble origin.[18]

In this position, he more or less served as a liaison man between the Commission, composed of Americans and Filipinos, and the Philippine Assembly then headed by Speaker Osmeña. He held this position until the organization of the Philippine Senate in 1916 as a consequence of the Jones Law. As a member of the Commission during the incumbency of Governor-General W. Cameron Forbes, he was chiefly responsible for convincing the former to order the restoration of Dr. Jose Rizal's relief map of the country which was constructed in front of the Dapitan church in Zamboanga as well as the conversion of the place where our national hero stayed in the outskirts of the town into a national park, and the acquisition by the government of the Filipiniana collection of La Tabacalera at the cost of ₱200,000.[19]

---

[17] Much later, *El Renacimiento* and nine of the men behind it including its editor, Teodoro M. Kalaw and its business manager, Martin Ocampo, were named respondents in a celebrated libel case filed against them in 1908 by no less than the then Secretary of the Interior, Dean C. Worcester. The litigation, which ended in 1913, was brought about by an editorial believed to have been written by Kalaw entitled, *Aves de Rapiña* or "Birds of Prey," which Worcester claimed, cast aspersions on his character. The actual author, however, as revealed in Kalaw's Memoirs, was the paper's city editor, Fidel A. Reyes, but the suit resulted in jail sentences and fines for its editor and business manager as well as the subsequent sale of the newspaper's properties when the publishers were asked to pay damages in the amount of ₱60,000. This brought to an end *El Renacimiento's* colorful and patriotic life although Governor-General Francis Burton Harrison, upon his arrival in the Islands in 1913, commuted the jail sentences of the paper's executives. Incidentally, Reyes was acquitted for lack of responsibility on the printed matter.

[18] Palma, *op. cit.*, p. 77. With Gregorio Araneta, they were the second group of Filipinos to be appointed to the Commission.

[19] Palma, *op. cit.*, p. 91. In the opinion of Rafael Corpuz, *op. cit.*, p. 252, his term in the Commission at this time "was the most fruitful period of his career."

Although the era of Filipinization of the Philippine government may be said to have officially started with the passage of the Philippine Autonomy Act in 1916 which provided for the abolition of the Philippine Commission and the establishment of the Philippine Senate, F. B. Harrison, the new Governor-General of the Islands, had already begun this movement by appointing Filipinos as chiefs and assistant chiefs in those offices vacated by Americans as a result of the change in administration with the victory of the Democratic Party in the U.S. national elections of 1912.

Under the banner of the Nacionalista Party,[20] Palma, who, by this time, had become "the acknowledged supreme counsellor of the (Nacionalista) party,"[21] tossed in his candidacy for senator that same year for the fourth senatorial district comprising the provinces of Rizal, Laguna, and Bataan, and the City of Manila and was elected with his running mate, Pedro Guevara. The term called for six years but in 1917, he was appointed by Governor-General Harrison to the Cabinet as Secretary of Interior, a post which he assumed without relinquishing his legislative position, thus earning the distinction of being the first official to hold concurrently a legislative and executive post which condition enabled him to act as a liaison man between the Governor-General and the Legislature, until his resignation on July 31, 1920.

Previous to his quitting the government however, Palma went abroad for the first time as vice-president of the first Philippine Independence Mission to the United States. With Quezon as its head, the Mission left the country on February 23, 1919.

After the expiration of his term as a senator, he ventured into private business but incurred financial losses so that he was forced to resume his law practice a year after.

Assumes U.P. Presidency

His leave from the limelight of public service was short, however, for in 1923, after the resignation of Guy Potter Benton as President of the State University, he was persuaded by the former to serve in an acting capacity. Two years later, on July 18, 1925, he was inaugurated as the University of the Philippines' fourth president—the second Filipino to assume this honored and much-respected position—after thrice rejecting it. Of his acceptance, he later wrote: "I never accepted a post with more fear and trepidation and with very little confidence in my capacity as I did that of the Presidency of the University."[22] He was not a stranger to the University nor to its problems though, for since the approval on June 11, 1908, of Act No. 1870 of the Philippine Assembly founding the University, he had continuously been a member of the University's Board of Regents. In fact, with José Escaler, they were the first Filipino members of the ruling body of the University.

---

[20] Palma, along with Quezon, Osmeña, Macario Adriatico, Felipe Agoncillo, Pablo Ocampo, Teodoro Sandiko, Leon Ma. Guerrero, and Isauro Gabaldon, founded it on March 12, 1907. The first three later constituted the so-called "OPQ Triumvirate" of Philippine politics.

[21] Corpuz, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

Under his administration, "the University of the Philippines was the home of untrammeled investigation into every sphere of knowledge. On its campus young minds felt the keen impact of new ideas, and learned to decide for themselves whether such ideas were worth keeping or should be discarded."[23] It was also during his incumbency when the University acquired its 400-hectare Basilan Land Grant. Furthermore, he stood out as an "unflinching fighter for the independence of the State University from political interference"[24] stating that "....unlike the institutions of religion and politics, the University is open-minded, willing to hear and discuss and improve. It encourages criticism, deprecates bigotry and leads in clarity..."[25] He buttressed his convictions on academic freedom especially with regard to the right of faculty members to air their views on important national issues when he wrote soon after his resignation from the University on December 31, 1933:

"Political, economic, and governmental matters cannot be exempted from the academic freedom of professors. If someone who feels competent to write on these subjects decides to do so, there should be no restriction on him except to maintain decency and equanimity in thought and in its presentation. Why should politics be a forbidden topic to professors when as citizens, imbued with democratic spirit, they ought to be interested in good government and the wise administration of public affairs? If this destructive belief be allowed to spread, we would hereafter be deprived of that invigorating contact and influence upon politics of the best portion of our citizenry which does not make of politics a profession, but which by its training and lofty sense of duty, has the aptitude and the desire to cleanse and elevate politics.

"If the professorial group were not so suppressed but allowed more freedom to take part in public discussions of political questions, there would doubtless exist a favorable influence in the management of our public offices because the government can count with the vigilance, criticism and counsel of that group of good citizens whose zeal is to stick to the truth without fear or favor."[26]

---

[22] Palma, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

[23] "A Monument That Will Live" (Editorial), *The Philippines Free Press*, XXXIII, 22 (June 3, 1939) p. 34.

[24] E. T. Santos, "G. P. Benton and Rafael Palma," *The Manila Time Daily Magazine*, January 7, 1958, p. B.

[25] Antonio Isidro, "Rafael Palma's Thoughts," *Phil. Journal of Education*, XXVII, 3 (September, 1948) p. 183.

These were his convictions and for them he stood even at the cost not only of his presidency of the State University but also his popularity with the people. It had been his honest belief that the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act which the 1931 Osmeña-Roxas (Os-Rox) Independence Mission brought back to the Islands in 1933 was the most favorable piece of legislation that could promise independence to the Filipino people obtainable from the United States Congress at that time and thus, he openly expressed his views. This was, however, in contradiction to the opinion held by then Senate President Quezon who headed the so-called *Antis* or those who opposed the Act, and as a consequence, Palma found himself under pressure from the Quezon-controlled legislature. Afraid that the University might suffer if he stuck to his position, he resigned, thus, culminating a decade of unselfish service to the education of the youth.

As U.P. President, one writer described him thus: "Few rectors have been as popular as Palma was during the 11 years of his term. He was liberal and insisted on academic freedom. He was progressive and attuned himself to the thoughts of the new generation. He was understanding, guiding rather than imposing, a wise old man who had a sly and slightly envious sympathy for the enthusiasm and agnosticism of youth."[27]

His Political Star Fades

Outside the University, Palma decided to fight for his convictions and what could have been a better place than the field of political combat? Therefore, in the elections of 1934, he ran for the Senate on the bandwagon of the *Pros* or those who favored the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. And he was sure of victory.

On the other hand, Quezon had not merely opposed the H.H.C. Act but he himself, went to Washington to get a better independence law. This proved to be decisive as a little more than a month before the elections, he returned to Manila with the Tydings-McDuffie Law, which although claimed by his opponents to be practically a "rehash" of the H.H.C. Act, nevertheless, appealed more to the Quezon-swept electorate. The results of that election proved disastrous not only to the *Pros* but to Rafael Palma as well. It has been claimed that he was so disappointed for this was his first political defeat in his career and as he himself said, he had expected the electorate to judge him better that his heart broke.[28] But he did not feel any resentment towards them whatsoever.

---

[26] "Palma on Academic Freedom," *Panorama,* VIII, 4 (April, 1956) p. 5.

[27] "Death of An Intellectual," *Phil. Free Press,* XXXIII, 22 (June 3, 1939) p. 25.

He was partly vindicated though when one month later in that same year, he was elected as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention which convened on July 30, 1934. Soon after the approval of the Charter, he began to experience difficulties he had theretofore not known. And although he was appointed as a lecturer in Legal Ethics at the University of the Philippines College of Law in June, 1935, his property worsened. However, he endured this uncomplainingly.

In 1937, he was the recipient from the University of Manila of the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws and a year later, he received from the institution which he had served so well, the same signal honor.

Reduced to penury and suffering a great deal from brain cancer, he did not falter and took them all with the same measure of greatness as his predecessors: M. H. del Pilar, Rizal, and all. He continued to write and his efforts bore fruit when he won the first prize with a cash award of ₱3,000, in the 1938 Commonwealth Biography Contest with his magnificent biography of Dr. Jose Rizal. (This was later translated from the Spanish original by ex-Justice Roman Ozaeta and published as *The Pride of the Malay Race* and now required reading in the nation's public schools.)[29] The government also purchased his Social History of the Philippines but up to this time it has yet to be published—a lamentable situation.

Rafael Palma, although occupied most of the time with his official duties, had found time to join distinguished organizations both here and abroad. A Spanish Academician, he was also a member of the Club Filipino, the Philippine Columbian Association, and the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the Philippines, of which he was its Grand Master in 1920.

The Death of Palma

Finally, on the evening of May 24, 1939, Palma, who at the time was chairman of the National Council of Education, an advisory body created to "study the various changes expected to be made in the Philippine Educational system," found peace in death although it is a well-known fact that priests of the Roman Catholic Church tried—but failed—to persuade him to retract his Masonic affiliation while he was on his death throes.[30] And on that day, the Philippines lost a dedicated and honest son, a politician who wielded so much power at the pinnacle of his career but who, with all candor, declared: "I detest fraud and hypocrisy and prefer to speak the truth even though it displeases friends. I admire civic spirit, sacrifice, and self-abnegation for public service. For this reason, I suffer morally people seeking public office for the sole benefit of themselves and of their friends."[31]

---

[28] Corpuz, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

[29] Ex-Justice Ozaeta says of the book: "It is the best, most compendious and most fruitful portrayal of the Filipino hero's life and character that has been written to date." (*Phil. Free Press*, XL, 25, June 18, 1949) p. 26.

His death was aptly described by a newspaperman who wrote: "When he died the nation grieved. His body lay in state at the Session Hall of the National Assembly, wrapped in the Filipino and American flags. Commonwealth President Manuel Quezon, Vice-President Sergio Osmeña, and Speaker José Yulo were at the head of those who paid him the Supreme final tributes. Flags all over the land were flown at half-mast. He was given a State funeral. The most important men of the time were his pallbearers."[32]

In recalling him some years ago, Ex-President Sergio Osmeña wrote: ". . . Honesty, sincerity, and integrity . . . is the personification of the character of Rafael Palma—a man who gave the best years of his life in the service of his country, yet who left little material wealth to his family, the while he bequeathed to his people the rich spiritual heritage of a high civic virtue, a pure and dauntless patriotism and a clean record of public service that has made him the recipient of his country's lasting gratitude."[33]

Incidentally, the book became a center of controversy several years ago due to the vehement objections of adherents of the Roman Catholic Church to certain portions of the book especially Chapter 33 which dealt with the "Critical Examination of Rizal's Alleged Retraction." This resulted in the official banning of the book by Archbishop Reyes of Manila. Of the Palma book controversy, the *Evening News Saturday Magazine* (February 18, 1950) noted: "Nothing has created so much furor since Rizal wrote the 'Noli'."

[30] Antonio Gonzalez, "Rafael Palma, the Mason," *Souvenir Program*, Grand Master's Official Visitation to All Rizal and Quezon City Lodges under the Jurisdiction of the MW Grand Lodge of F. & A.M. in the Philippines; Second Convention of Lodges in Masonic District No. 9; Seventh Annual Convention of Rizal and Quezon City Lodges, December 30, 1960, pp. 25.

A somewhat different version of this incident appeared in the June 3, 1939 issue of the *Phil. Free Press*, (loc. cit.) "Death of an Inllectual."

[31] Palma, *op. cit.* pp. 11-12.

[32] *The Manila Times*, May 24, 1949.

[33] Sergio Osmeña in "Foreword" to Palma, *My Autobiography*, p. 2.

LEON MA. GUERRERO'S EDITION OF RIZAL'S MEMORIAS DE UN ESTUDIANTE DE MANILA

By Sister Maria Amelia Rosales, R.V.M.
Ateneo Graduate School

The author brings up for critical consideration what she believes are flaws and inaccuracies in Leon Ma. Guerrero's *The Young Rizal,* an English translation of Jose Rizal's autobiography. Her sole motivation, she states, is her sincere desire to enhance the value of the Rizal document as a piece of Rizalina.

I

On the occasion of the observance of the 88th birthday anniversary of Dr. Jose P. Rizal, Messers. Alberto and Tomas F. Barretto undertook the publication of *"P. Jacinto: Memorias de Un Estudiante de Manila."* The latter was an unpublished autobiography of Rizal covering the first seventeen years of his life. It was written between the years 1878 and 1881, after Rizal's graduation from the Ateneo de Manila.

The publication of the *Memorias* was planned and undertaken as a cultural project. Its principal aim, in the words of Mr. Andres Soriano, President of San Miguel Brewery, Inc., which took care of defraying the expenses of publication, was "to encourage and propagate the study of Spanish among the young men and women in our schools, in accordance with the provisions of the recently enacted law, Act No. 343, and, incidentally, render homage to the memory of the Great Patriot, Dr. Jose Rizal Mercado."

Under the title *Memorias de Un Estudiante de Manila, por el Dr. Jose Rizal Mercado,* the work was dedicated to the youth of the Philippines. In their dedicatory statement, the editors urged the boys and girls in our schools to "imbibe the rich essence of Rizal's words, . . . and to emulate his strong desire to learn the Spanish language, . . . the medium of expression that he used to arouse the patriotic fervor which enabled our people to attain their emancipation."

The prologue of the edition was written by Jaime C. de Veyra, member of the *Real Academia de La Lengua Española,* and a well known authority on Rizal. The edition also included Rizal's poem, *A La Juventud Filipina,* and, as epilogue, de Veyra's commentary on that poem.

The *Memorias* has eight chapters. Chapter one entitled, "Mi Nacimiento—Mis Primeros Años," was written, according to Rizal's annotation at the end of the chapter, at No. 8 Dulumbayan, Santa Cruz, Manila, on September 11, 1878. Chapter two, "Mi Vida Lejos De Mis Padres," was written at No. 22 Calle Salcedo, Manila, on Monday, October 28, 1878. Chapter three, "Desde El Enero Del 71 Hasta El Junio Del 72," was written, like the preceding chapter, at No. 22 Calle Salcedo, on November 1, 1878. Chapter four, 'Desde El 72 Hasta El 75," was written in Calamba, on April 7, 1879. Chapter five, "Dos Años En El Colegio," was written in Manila, on December 1, 1879. Chapter six, "Desde El April Del 77 Hasta El Diciembre Del Mismo Año," was also written in Manila, on November 16, 1881. The last chapter, "Desde El Enero Del 78 Al Diciembre Del Mismo," does not have Rizal's notation as to the place and time in which it was written. It can only be presumed that Rizal wrote it in the same place and at about the same time that the preceding chapter was written.

The project involving the publication of Rizal's *Memorias* was unquestionably most commendable. It made easily available and accessible and, therefore, more widely known, a document of great historical value and interest, an indispensable source of information on Rizal as a young man. The document reveals to us, in Rizal's own language, his youthful thoughts, his feelings, his reactions. Reflected in its pages are interesting facets of his personality—his love for study, his orderly and methodical habits, his filial love and loyalty, his unfailing courtesy, his high regard for truth and honor. These are virtues most worthy of emulation by the youth of the country. Well, therefore, could Jaime C. de Veyra say in his "Prologue," "let us take Rizal for our model; let us imitate his example; let us be other Rizals."

II

In 1950, an English edition of the *Memorias,* authored by Leon Ma. Guerrero, came out of the press, under the title *The Young Rizal.* The work included, apart from the text of the English translation of the *Memorias,* translations in English of Rizal's early poems, the one-act play "Junto Al Pasig" and the allegory, "El

Consejo de los Dioses." Also forming part of the work were the author's "Notes" on the Rizal autobiography and on the other literary works above-mentioned and a copy of the Spanish text of the *Memorias*. The book had three "Introductions" supplied respectively by Claro M. Recto, Jaime C. de Veyra and Vidal A. Tan.

What prompted Guerrero to undertake the task of putting out his own edition of the *Memorias* was explained by Guerrero himself in his preface to his work. Among other things, he wrote:

> If Rizal has a message for the Filipinos, he should be allowed to give it himself because he is the best authority on his own life . . . But since most of the Filipinos are unfamiliar with the language in which Rizal usually wrote, whole generations of Filipinos now know Rizal, his nature, his thoughts, and the convictions for which he died, only at second-hand, if at all . . . To translate Rizal's wroks is to rescue them from the tragedy of unreadability.

In the preparation of his edition, Guerrero took pains to examine closely the original manuscript. Of this, there is ample evidence noticeable in his descriptions of the original document, his many allusions to it in his "Notes" and his supplying a number of words and phrases which Rizal erased, changed or omitted in his manusscript.

The Young Rizal, like the Barretto edition of the *Memorias,* is a valuable addition to Rizaliana. It is particularly useful to that body of young Filipinos who, because of their unfamiliarity with Spanish, are much handicapped in their efforts to learn and understand the mind of Rizal. This point was underscored by Claro M. Recto in his "Introduction." Recto in part wrote:

> Because biographers are essentially interpreters who, consciously or unconsciously, end up by reading their own convictions into their material and by coloring with their prejudices and predilections the judgments which they make upon the lives and deeds of men already silenced by death, our own idea of Rizal often depends on which of his biographies we read . . . The real and true Rizal can be rediscovered in Rizal's own view of himself . . . The surprising thing is that this authentic autobiography of Rizal, the only story of his life, or part of it, from his own hand, has never been given until now the importance and attention it so clearly deserves . . . Only the barrier of language separates the young Rizal from the other young Filipinos of suceeding generations and I am gratified that the barrier has been overcome with this translation of Rizal's recollection by Leon Ma. Guerrero.

III

The task of translating a document is not by any means an easy one. It requires of the translator a good command of the language in which the document was written and, at the same time, the ability to reproduce clearly and accurately in a new language the thought and meaning of the writer of the document. That Guerrero met these requirements is indisputable. In the opinion of Mr. Recto, Guerrero was well qualified for the task of translating Rizal's *Memorias.* "Guerrero is one of the few Filipinos," Recto wrote in his Introduction, "who has a thorough command of Spanish for he belongs to a family of illustrious men of letters who spoke and wrote to perfection in this language. In addition he enjoys a well-deserved reputation as one of the foremost Filipino stylists in English, so much so that few could rival him in the elegance of his language."

Coming as it does from a man of the intellectual stature of Mr. Recto whose proficiency in both Spanish and English is well known, the appraisal contained in the above-quoted statement cannot but be readily accepted by close students of Rizal, including the writer of this paper. Being a human product, however, it can well be said that Guerrero's edition of Rizal's autobiography is not without its share of imperfections. In the same way that Guerrero did not pretend to be greater than Rizal when he pointed out in his edition what he considered as inaccuracies committed by the hero when he wrote his autobiography, so this writer, without in the least pretending to be greater than Guerrero, proposes to bring up for critical consideration what she believes are flaws and inaccuracies in Guerrero's *The Young Rizal.* She undertakes this task in all humility, animated solely by a sincere desire to enhance the value of the Rizal document as a piece of Rizaliana.

Being concerned only with the autobiography part of *The Young Rizal,* the writer of this paper has limited herself to the study of the Spanish reprint of the *Memorias,* Guerrero's English translation of it, the "Notes" that follow the Spanish text, and the more copious annotations which accompany the English translation.

1.. In his preface (p. 14), Guerrero says: "He (Rizal) confesses in his *Memorias* that he scarcely spoke Spanish when he started his studies at the Ateneo at the age of nine or ten."

One cannot help wondering why the author made the double guess of "nine or ten," both guesses wrong, when, in the first paragraph of the Spanish text which he has reprinted in his book, Rizal clearly stated how old he was when he started to study in the Ateneo.

Rizal's words are: "Contaba entonces once años" (p. 148), which Guerrero correctly translated into: "I was then eleven years old." (p. 32)

2. In the second chapter of the English translation, we read: "I left Binyang, then, on the seventh of December, 1871. I was then nine years old. It was Saturday, at one in the afternoon." (p. 27)

In No. 22 of his "Notes" (p. 95), Guerrero, referring to this statement, commented thus: "Rizal seems to have made a slight mistake of recollection. In December 1871, he was ten, not nine, years old."

One can hardly reconcile Rizal's perfect recollection of the day and the hour he left Binyang to his not remembering his age at the time. Rizal might have made a clerical error in jotting down the year, but it is most unlikely that he forgot how old he was. The fact that Rizal entitled the next chapter "From January '71 to June '72" proves that the December referred to in the previous chapter was December, 1870. Rizal was nine years old in December 1870.

Besides, Rizal himself, at the beginning of the same chapter, stated that he was nine years old when he left Calamba to study in Binyang. Although he merely said that he was nine years old without giving the month and the year of his departure, it was probably the usual time for classes to begin that year. And the year must be 1870 for, toward the end of the first chapter, he wrote thus: "I stayed there (Calamba) until 1870, the year when I was first separated from my family."

Incidentally, it may be stated that the photostatic copy of the *Memorias* kept in the *Jose Rizal Centennial Office* shows that the date Rizal wrote was "el 17 de diciembre de 1870." The translator thus made a double error. First, he miscopied the year in the original document, and, second, he changed "17 de diciembre" into "the 7th of December."

3. In the next-to-the-last paragraph of chapter 2 of the English translation (p. 28), we read: "My brothers never tired of talking with me." It is the translator's rendition of: "No cesaban de hablarme mis *hermanos*." (Italics supplied)

Rizal had only one brother. The rest of the family, were girls, nine of them. A more faithful rendition of the word *hermanos* in the sentence would be in this writer's view, "my brother and sisters."

4. In chapter 3 of the *Memorias,* Rizal spoke of an uncle of his, Don Jose Alberto, who had just arrived from abroad, and whose unfaithful wife implicated Rizal's mother in a case where she accused her husband of trying to poison her and pointed to Doña Teodora, Rizal's mother, as an accomplice. Guerrero in Note 23 (p. 95), stated that this uncle was a cousin of Rizal's mother.

Guerrero must have used as authority for his statement Palma's *Biografia de Rizal,* which claims that Jose Alberto was a cousin of Rizal's mother. It is to be noted, however, that Austin Craig, who has done much research work on the genealogy of Rizal, claimed that Jose Alberto was a half-brother of Teodora Alonzo. What, it may be asked, is the true relationship between Jose Alberto and Teodora Alonzo?

We know that Teodora Alonzo's parents, Lorenzo Alberto Alonzo and Brigida de Quintos, had five children—two daughters (Narcisa and Teodora), and three sons (Gregorio, Manuel and Jose). We know, too, from a letter that Rizal wrote to Blumentritt, dated November 8, 1888, London (Carta #56, p. 334, *Epistolario Rizalino,* vol. 5, Primera Parte), that one of his mother's brothers was, to use his own words, "educated in Europe, spoke German, English, Spanish and French, and was a Knight of the Order of Isabel, the Catholic." The "brother" referred to in the letter was none other than Jose Alberto, the person mentioned by Rizal in chapter 3 of his *Memorias* as "tio mio (don Jose Alberto)."

In the light of Rizal's own statement, Jose Alberto could not have been a cousin of Rizal's mother as claimed by Guerrero and Palma, or a half brother, as claimed by Craig. Otherwise, Rizal would have used in the text of his letter to Blumentritt the word "primo" (cousin), or "medio hermano" (half-brother), instead of "hermano."

Why Jose used "Alberto" as his family name instead of "Alonzo" is not at all strange. Rizal himself used "Rizal" as his family name rather than "Mercado", and his mother at times used "Realonda" instead of the family name "Alonzo."

5. In chapter 6 of the Spanish text, Rizal wrote: "Sucedió que cambié de domicilio y que una hermana mía entró en el Colegio de la Concordia, en donde la joven K. era pensionista." In his Note, p. 101, Guerrero gives the name of this sister as "Narcisa."

It is inexcusable for Guerrero to make a glaring mistake in the identification of Rizal's sister. Right in the next paragraph, Rizal himself furnished the clue to the identification when he stated that his sister Olimpia was studying in the college where the girl

K. was a boarder. It is quite obvious that Guerrero used uncritically as his source on this point Palma's *Biografia* which claimed that the sister in question was Narcisa.

6. In the same chapter, Rizal wrote: "Llegó el ocho de diciembre, fiesta del colegio del cual era pensionista." Guerrero translated this into: "The eighth of December arrived, feast day of the college in which I was a boarder."

In Note 69, page 102, Guerrero commented on the foregoing as follows: "The reference is to the Ateneo whose patroness is the Immaculate Conception, an appellation of the Virgin Mary honored on the 8th of December. It is difficult, however, to understand how Rizal could have been a 'boarder' at the Ateneo when it is remembered that he had taken lodgings on Solana Street."

Guerrero here attributes to Rizal a mistake which is not of his making. The mistake arises from the translator's assigning a wrong connotation to Rizal's words. The Spanish word "era," being both a first and third person form of the verb "ser," could mean either "I was" or "she was." Since "pensionista" can be used for both the masculine and the feminine genders and can correctly be used to refer to either Rizal or the girl K., it can not shed light on the matter. But that Rizal was not referring to the Ateneo but to Concordia College, whose patron saint is also the Immaculate Conception and where the young K. was a boarder, is borne by a study of the sentences that follow, all of which point to the fact that the college referred to was not the college where Rizal was or had been a boarder but the one where the young K. and Rizal's sister were studying.

7. Guerrero in Note 47, page 99, considers erroneous Rizal's attributing to Father Sanchez "the supervision of his studies in 'mathematics, rhetoric and Greek' during his first year in college, corresponding to the fifth year of the course," on the ground that Rizal was not enrolled in a course of Greek that year.

It is true that, according to the official records of the Ateneo, during the school 1875-76 (Rizal's fourth year in the school, although in the official records it was the fifth because Rizal was given credit for his previous arithmetic studies) Rizal gained credits for three courses, namely: Rhetoric and Poetry, French and Geometry and Trigonometry. It is quite possible that Rizal, writing some years later, might have confused the French that he took that year with the Greek that he took the previous year. But it is more likely that Rizal was privately helped by Father Sanchez to improve his knowledge of Greek although he was no longer taking that subject as a regular part of his course that year. In fact, although Spanish was not one of the subjects for which he was officially credited that year, the priest helped him much in his study of Spanish as Rizal himself attested in his autobiography. (Page 37, *The Young Rizal)*.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Rizal took drawing lessons under a private tutor and that his school records do not credit him for drawing that year or any other year. Moreover, the next year, although he was no longer taking Poetry as a curricular requirement, he continued, to use his own words, "To speak and cultivate the beautiful language of Olympus under the direction of Father Sanchez." (Page 38, *The Young Rizal.)*

From the facts above mentioned, it seems quite clear that what Rizal wrote about his being helped by Father Sanchez in mathematics, rhetoric and Greek should not be taken to mean that he took all these subjects as parts of the curriculum prescribed in his first year in college.

8. In the first sentence on page 38, in the English version, Rizal speaks of his being in the fifth year of his college course. Commenting on this point, Guerrero in Note 47, page 99, said:

> This reference to the "fifth" year of the course is confusing, as are other references of Rizal to his age and the studies he was taking. One fault in recollection has already been adverted to in Note 15. Various others may be found in this part of his memoirs. Thus, Rizal notes that he began his studies in Manila in 1872, but the official records of the Ateneo give him credit for the year 1871-72. He writes that Cantu's work helped him excel in universal history in his third year, but this subject, again according to the official curriculum, was taken in the fourth year. At the end of this year he remarks that he was "almost 13 years old," yet at this time, which was presumably sometime in March 1875, he was already 13 and almost 14, which is indeed the age he assigns himself when he speaks of entering college in June 1875. Finally he attributes to Father Sanchez the supervision of his studies in "mathematics, rhetoric and Greek" during his first year in college, corresponding to the fifth year of the course, when according to the curriculum, there was no course in Greek that year.

This litany of Rizal's supposed faults of memory needs to be examined critically in fairness to Rizal. For it gives one the impression that Rizal's autobiography is littered with inaccuracies, when, as will presently be shown, the supposedly erroneous statements in the *Memorias* are quite accurate as statements of historical facts.

Guerrero's criticisms may be split up into separate items and enumerated as follows:

(a) Rizal speaks of the school year 1876-1877 as his fifth when according to official records in the Ateneo, it was the sixth year of the course.

(b) He said he was nine years old when he left Biñang on Dec. 7, 1871, when he should be ten on that date. This is the fault of recollection adverted to in Guerrero's Note 15, according to the above-quoted passage. The matter, however, was taken up in Note 22, not in Note 15.

(c) Rizal notes that he began his studies in Manila in 1872, but the official records of the Ateneo give him credit for the year 1871-72.

(d) Rizal speaks of having taken universal history in 1874-1875, when he was, according to him, in the third year, but according to the official records, that was the fourth year of credited studies.

(e) Rizal says that at the end of the school year 1874-75, he was almost thirteen when the truth is that he was almost fourteen then.

(f) He attributes to Father Sanchez the supervision of his studies in mathematics, rhetoric and Greek when he was in the first year in college, 1875-76, although Greek was not offered that year.

In this writer's opinion, Rizal, far from being "confused" in his references to his age and to his studies, as Guerrero claims, was surprisingly keen of memory. Numerous instances can be cited from his autobiography to substantiate this claim. He remembered accurately that he was admitted in the Ateneo in June, 1872; that he was nine when he left Calamba to study in Biñan; that he stayed in that town till December, 1870; that after a few days of his arrival in Calamba, it was decided that he should remain there; that in the meantime, he studied under a teacher although he learned nothing more than the multiplication table; that it was decided that he should go to Manila, accompanied by his brother, Paciano, to take the entrance examinations and to enroll in the secondary course in the Ateneo; that he took the examinations in Letran on June 10, 1872; that he was eleven years old when he was admitted at the Ateneo a few days later; that he enrolled for the second year during the school year 1873-74; that he was in the third year during the school year 1874-75 and that one of his subjects was World History; that he entered college on June 16, 1875, and that he was thirteen years old going fourteen; that Father Francisco de Paula Sanchez was his professor whose help enabled him to advance rapidly in his study of Spanish; that Father Sanchez also helped him in mathematics, rhetoric and Greek; that in the next school year (1875-76) he was a "philosopher"; that he had other professors, but he continued to write poetry under the direction of Father Sanchez; that at the end of his second year in college he graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

All the references above-cited to events of his life are historically accurate. They reflect keenness of memory in Rizal. There is consistency and orderliness in his recollections. There is no indication of confusion in his mind as regards dates of the academic years which he spent in the Ateneo or the courses that he took during those years.

The confusion is in the minds of those who give to the first entry in Rizal's school records at the Ateneo a weight and meaning that it does not have. The first part of the Ateneo records which Guerrero reproduced in his Notes is as follows:

1871-1872	Arithmetic	Excellent
1872-1873	Latin I	Excellent
	Spanish	Excellent
	Greek	Excellent
1873-1874	Latin II	Excellent
	Spanish	Excellent
	Greek	Excellent
	World Geography	Excellent

In trying to clear up the supposed "confusion" in Rizal's references to his studies, especially to 1874-75, referred to by Rizal as his third year, and 1876-77, referred to as his fifth year, but which appear as the fourth and the sixth entries, respectively, in the record, Guerrero says that it would appear that Rizal, either was mistaken when he said he started his studies in 1872, or that the Ateneo merely gave him credit for one subject, arithmetic, on the basis of the entrance examination he had taken in Letran. He adds that the second hypothesis seems to be the more reasonable. To quote his words on this point,

> this would explain why Rizal refers continuously to the "fifth" year of the course, which, from the subjects he took, appear to have been really the sixth year; if he had started his studies in the second year of the course, it would naturally appear to his memory to have been the "first" year, *his* first year.
>
> Another reason for believing that what he calls the "fifth" year was actually the sixth year of the course lies in the fact that, accord-

> ing to the official curriculum, the sixth year was devoted entirely to philosophy and the natural sciences, which was the reason why, to Rizal's chagrin, he was told to "stop communing with the muses" through the cultivation of poetry and rhetoric, subjects to the real fifth year of the course, and Rizal's "fourth."

Guerrero here absolves Rizal from the fault of erratic memory, but he still seems to believe that Rizal had not called his curriculum years by their right names. This writer finds it hard to believe that a boy of the intelligence of Rizal would commit the mistake that Gurrero atributes to Rizal. The dullest student of today would know to what year the subjects he is taking belong, no matter how many extra times he has been enrolled as a result of failing grades. If Rizal indeed started his studies in the second year of the course, would he not know it and and call the curriculum year by its proper name? Rizal should be credited with enough intelligence to know that the course he had finished was a six-year course, even if he finished it in five years, and that the last year was the sixth year.

In fairness to Rizal, his account of his studies, consistent as it is in every important detail, should be accepted at its face value. We do not have good reason for doubting the accuracy of its references to his studies simply because of an entry in his school records that finds no explanation or reference in his story.

Guerrero seems to believe that the first year of the secondary course at the Ateneo that Rizal took up had only one subject, arithmetic, and on that assumption he based his explanation of Rizal's supposed faults of memory. It is incredible, however, that the curriculum should have in the first year only one subject. A more logical and plausible explanation for the entry in the school record is that the results of Rizal's entrance examination showed that he already knew the arithmetic proper for the first year and, therefore, was exempted from it in the first year of his studies in the Ateneo and was given credit for it as though he took it the previous year. This would mean that the first year had four subjects proper to it: arithmetic, Latin I, Spanish and Greek, in the same way that the second year also had four subjects. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the arithmetic for which Rizal was credited for the year 1871-72 really belonged to the same curriculum year, 1872-73, as the three subjects he was credited for that year. This would explain the supposed errors (a), (c) and (d) enumerated above.

Supposed error (b) has already been dealt with in No. 2 above and error (f), in No. 7. This leaves item (e) as the only criticism that may be considered valid.

Guerrero here is right in saying that Rizal has made a mistake when he wrote that, at the end of the school year 1874-75, he was almost thirteen years old. However, this cannot be an error of memory because, close to this mistake which appears at the end of the fourth chapter, Rizal stated near the beginning of the next chapter that he was "thirteen going on fourteen" when he entered the Ateneo as a boarding student on June 16, 1875. So the mistake must have been clerical, not a "fault of recollection" as Guerrero claims.

The flaws and imperfections above noted in Guerrero's *The Young Rizal* need not detract from the merit of that work as a work of scholarship. The English translation was well done. The work itself is a valuable contribution to Rizaliana. It has made readily accessible and available to the English-speaking youth of the Philippines a writing of the hero, the reading of which can given them moments of delight and inspiration.

RIZAL'S NOLI *AND* FILI: *THE FILIPINO BIBLES* *

By Gabriel F. Fabella
President Emeritus, PHA

That we should be earnest in teaching the life and works of our national hero Jose Rizal is the appeal made by the author. He believes that Rizal's life and writings, like the Bible, could be the object of a lifelong study and proposes that the *Noli* and the *Fili* be made the sacred books of the Filipinos.

It was while abroad that I came across Fulton Oursler's *The Greatest Book Ever Written.* Of course he is referring to the *Bible* which in plain English means "book", the book of books. While we assume that the bible is intended for all peoples, some would not recognize it as theirs. That is why the Arabs have their *Kuran,* the ancient Persians their *Avesta,* the ancient Hindus the *Vedas;* the Soviet Russians the writings of Karl Marx, Lenin and Stalin. Other nations have sacred books of their own.

The Filipino people who profess the Christian faith should have the Bible for their sacred book. It is a sad commentary, however, to state that instead of encouraging our people to read the sacred book, some religious denominations are discouraging its perusal. Such groups claim that the ordinary mortal should not read a book that is beyond his comprehension. They allege that to be able to read the Bible and understand it well, a special training is necessary. We do not subscribe to such a view. One of the objectives of schooling is to train people to read and interpret for themselves whatever they read, and not to depend upon experts or so-called authorities. If the assumption that ordinary mortals cannot understand the book, were correct, then, the statement that "no library is complete without the bible" would have no meaning. We agree with Fulton Oursler that the Bible is the greatest book ever written, and every home should have one even if there be no library.

---

* This article is an adaptation from a speech delivered on 7 October, (1961), before the Philippine Christian College constituency in connection with its foundation day. Its original title was "Jose Rizal In Our Times."

Some have argued that the Bible deals primarily with things of the next life and not of the present. This argument, it seems, is not well taken. Those who have a bowing acquaintance with the book know that it embraces both the life here as well as life beyond the grave. Since our Muslim brothers in the South do not consider the Bible as their sacred book, perhaps, it would help the cause of Filipino nationalism if we adopt the writings of Rizal, especially the *Noli* and the *Fili,* as our sacred books. These two works of his approximate the Bible in the sense that we may derive from them comfort, inspiration and guidance for our individual lives as well as for our collective life as a nation.

It is an admitted fact that Jose Rizal is not only our national hero. As a genius who appears but once in every two centuries according to Ferdinand Blumentritt, Rizal is a citizen of the world and he belongs to all mankind. The Filipinos should feel honored to have produced a Rizal because other nations are not as fortunate as we. [They have not produced a man of Rizal's caliber.] As a benefactor of mankind, Rizal can never be forgotten for great men never die. One hundred and one years after his birth, and sixty-six years after his martyrdom, Rizal is still first in the hearts of his countrymen. Perhaps, he will remain first within the next two centuries, for his life is a shining example to us and his writings are the means by which to mould the character of his people, and shape the destiny of this country. From his writings we may learn the solutions to the problems facing our Republic today.

As a young nation the Philippines is beset with tremendous and perplexing problems. By way of illustrating our thesis two of such problems shall be discussed very briefly. These are: (1) integrating the minorities of our population; and (2) breaking the alien stranglehold on our economy.

Our political independence was restored to us on July 4, 1946. Does this mean that we have regained the Paradise that Rizal mentioned as lost in his "Ultimo Adios"? In attempting to answer this question we must be honest to ourselves, and when we do, we shall find the verdict to be in the negative. This is because our national edifice was not constructed on solid foundations. We were not thoroughly prepared for the advent of complete independence. It lacks, for one, a strong national cohesion. We have among us considerable minority groups that must be assimilated and integrated with the majority of Filipinos. These minorities should be raised to the level of culture as the others so that there could be a greater solidarity among our people. We should make them feel that all of us are brothers with a common Fatherland. The need to do this may be gleaned from the two illustrations that follow.

Sometime ago during a class discussion in a course on Filipino nationalism at the University of the Philippines, an Igorot boy stood up one day to inform the class that he read somewhere Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo's speech which stated that Igorots are not Filipinos. As he uttered those words the boy was so affected by emotion that he was on the point of tears. He further said, "If Romulo meant what he said, then I am not your brother."

Gentle reader, you can well imagine how embarrassing that situation was. We had to console the Igorot boy by saying that Romulo could not have uttered those words; that he was probably misquoted, and all that sort of alibi. But certainly, little incidents like this one, are harmful to the national cause. We must, therefore, be careful in dealing with such as those because as Malayans, they are as sensitive as we. We should never give them occasion to feel that they are not one with us, otherwise, we may never be able to integrate them in the Filipino body politic.

Another illustration may help to bring home my point. The inhabitants of southern Mindanao and Sulu profess the faith of Islam, but they are no different from us. Like us, they are also Malayans, the bravest, perhaps, the most patriotic of Filipinos. They kept fighting the Spaniards for three centuries and they were never fully conquered. Encouraged by the Spaniards we had looked upon our Muslim brothers as our enemies on account of their religion. We joined the punitive expeditions against our blood brothers who, in turn, retaliated by raiding our coastal towns, carrying away much booty and many slaves. The net result was their estrangement from us.

During the American era the Yankees did little to promote the feeling of affinity and solidarity between Christians and Muslims. Of course, they had motives of their own. They want to keep Mindanao for themselves, and during our independence campaigns, the imperialists kept insisting that the Muslims did not desire union with an independent Filipino nation; that they preferred to remain under American rule and protection. Of course, the Americans later on, abandoned the idea of segregating Mindanao from our country when they saw that the vast majority of Filipinos frowned upon this piece of Yankee imperialism. The result was that when independence finally came the Muslims were not yet reconciled nor assimilated with their Christian brothers of the North.

We must do something to promote the integration of our Muslim brothers in the South.

During the last few years, our government has done something to foster the Filipino national spirit among those people. There is an office taking charge of the movement toward integration. The University of Mindanao was created, and last June, 1962, classes were started at Marawi City at Lanao. This is a step in the right direction, but each and every one of us can do our share towards cementing the bonds that unite us with our Muslim brothers.

It has been intimated just a few minutes back that Malayans are a very sensitive people and the Muslim Filipinos are no exception. To begin with let us understand that they hate to be called "Moros". To them that word is an approbrium and an insult. They neither liked the reference to their faith as "Mohammedanism". The correct terms are *Muslims* and *Islam* respectively. In order to gain their goodwill so that they may be integrated with us, let us refrain from using those derogatory words. Let us also get rid of religious bigotry and fanaticism. Let us remember that Rizal emphasized the brotherhood of man as well as the equality of all religions. These are but some ways of helping the integration movement.

As important as national integration is the economic problem. While political independence has been attained we have not gained economic independence, not even economic sufficiency. The late Don Juan Sumulong was right when he asserted that without economic independence, the political independence is a joke—a *biró-biró* independence. When a people do not control their economic destiny, he insisted, they are not truly independent.

A very recent illustration is the artificial crisis in rice. There is no shortage of rice, but unscrupulous aliens manipulated the rice supply in the markets so as to increase prices and thus line their pockets. Under similar techniques and with the selfish connivance of some of our own countrymen, the price of sugar was also manipulated. What happened to rice and sugar could happen to our other economic needs. Our main handicap is that we do not control our economic destiny. That destiny is in the hands of aliens, and we are, therefore, almost strangers in our own homes. This is a very lamentable situation and something must be done about it. **

The solutions to our economic problems is entirely within our hands. It should be our endeavor to recover the control of our re-

---

** The incidents mentioned here occurred before October of 1961.

sources, our agricultural products, our industries, our trade and commerce. It is true that sporadic attempts had been made in the past towards this end. The *Bagong Katipunan* and the NEPA (National Economic Protectionism Association) were aimed at economic independence. The Retail Trade Act was a step in that direction, and the "Filipino First" policy aims at the same thing. But these efforts are not enough unless all of us cooperate wholeheartedly with our leaders.

In his "Sobre la indolencia de los Filipinos," Rizal pointed out that in pre-Spanish times the Filipinos were not indolent. They were busy-bees: agriculture, of course, was the main source of livelihood of the people; they supplemented this with gold-mining, fishing, manufacturers of all kinds, weaving, wine-making, etc., there was an active coasting trade, as well as trade between the coast-dwellers with those of the interior; there was also trade with foreign countries like China, Siam, Cambodia, Borneo, Japan, India, and others. It was evident that there was prosperity. There was life. All these activities were in the hands and under the control of our forefathers. Why can we not do the same today that we have attained sovereignty again? This is what Rizal actually intimated in his writings.

In this brief discussion of just two of our pressing problems, it has been pointed out that we should find their solutions in the teachings of Jose Rizal. In fact Rizal's teachings could be applied to all aspects of our life. In short, Rizal is a bible whence we could derive remedies to cure the ills of our country. Rizal's teachings, therefore, are relevant today as they were in his own days.

If Rizal is such relevant, it becomes our obligation to seriously study his life and writings. Republic Act 1425 prescribes the study of Rizal's *Noli* and *Fili* in college in their unexpurgated editions. It is a good law specially because with the serious study of the *Noli* and the *Fili,* Filipino nationalism could be promoted effectively. Unfortunately, in some private schools and colleges, the teaching of the Rizal course is but perfunctory. They merely comply superficially with its provisions. There is little attempt to study the *Noli* and the *Fili* intensively because in some private colleges, the course is merely integrated with one of the social studies. In others, while it is true that Rizal is offered as a separate course, it carries only one hour of credit. Is it possible to study such works *intensively* in one hour each week? To us this is a palpable violation of the intent and spirit of Republic Act 1425.

To this general indictment there are, of course, some exceptions, and one of these is the Philippine Christian College. We are reliably informed that when the Rizal course was first offered in this college, it carried six hours of credit as against the three hours prescribed at the state university. It is evident, therefore, that this college is exerting every effort to implement the letter and spirit of the law. For this reason the Philippine Christian College should be commended highly.

Let me repeat that we should be earnest in the teaching of the Rizal course for our own good. It should be understood, however, that great care be exerted to present Rizal as he really was—as a human being subject to human frailties. Let us not exaggerate his achievements and make him a god. Neither should we underrate him and make him a playboy as some colleges do. Above all, we must emphasize his passionate devotion to his country's welfare so much so that he sacrificed his very life on her behalf. Let us remember, too, that by his sacrifice he forged a new nation into being. He was actually the architect of the Filipino nation. This fact must be thoroughly engrained in the hearts of all Filipinos.

Like the Bible Rizal's life and writings could be the object of a lifelong study. Inquire of any serious student of Rizal and he will tell you that he knows very little of the Great Malayan. There are people, in fact, who have spent fifteen to twenty years of their lives studying Rizal and they confess the inadequacy of their knowledge of the hero. Whatever offering our colleges are giving is, therefore, utterly inadequate. Such offering, however, could serve merely to awaken interest on the subject. The more serious study of Rizal, like most subjects, would follow the graduation from college. Like the Bible Rizal's works should be read and studied continuously for everytime we read them, we discover some things that we must have missed before. The appeal here, then, is to make the *Noli* and the *Fili* as our sacred books. They are the two greatest books ever written—by a Filipino.

EVOLUTION OF THE ALLEGED RETRACTION OF RIZAL

By Leopoldo R. Serrano
Governor, PHA

The author presents what he considers to be the evolution of the Rizal retraction. He repeats an age-old question regarding the various versions and is inclined to the conclusion that there are five different documents of the retraction.

In order to understand fully the significance of the controversial matter in question, it is advisable to know the history or evolution of the so-called retraction of our greatest national hero.

Captain Ricardo Carnicero, the politico-military governor of Dapitan and the Spanish officer assigned to guard Rizal when he began his life of exile in that far-away town, was the first to mention something about the possibility of the hero's retraction. In his letter to Governor General Despujol on August 30, 1892, or forty-four days after Rizal arrived at Dapitan, Carnicero said: " . . . I have the assurance that Rizal, in Dapitan, would retract all, leaving for a long time and perhaps forever his friends and politics . . ."

That eminent American Rizalist, Professor Austin Craig, in an interview with a representative of the *Philippines Herald* on June 20, 1935, stated that Rizal, in order to do away with the objection of the Catholic Church to his marriage to Josephine Bracken, signed a retraction in Dapitan, in 1894. The document was forwarded by Fr. Antonio Obach, the Jesuit priest of Dapitan, to the bishop of Cebu, who had ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Dapitan. But no action was taken on that retraction. Evidently, it was written on Rizal's terms, which did not satisfy the higher ecclesiastical authorities. Thus, Rizal and Josephine lived together in Talisay without the benefit of a church wedding, although such affair scandalized the parish priest who kept on attacking the hero from the pulpit. That document has not been revealed to this day.

The next report of a document of retraction signed by Dr. Rizal appeared in *Heraldo de Madrid* on December 30, 1896, or on the same day he was executed. A part of the report sent by its Manila correspondent reads:

> Rizal was reconciled to the Church (Catholic-S.) solemnly abjuring his errors.
>
> He signed a solemn retraction of masonry, declaring that his faith is the only true religion.

The following day (December 31, 1896), another Madrid paper, *El Imparcial,* announced that the hero "signed, with several military witnesses, a retraction of his religious errors." *El Imparcial* quoted fully the retraction signed by Rizal, which follows:

> Me declaro católico; quiero vivir y muero como católico, me retracto de todo corazón de cuanto he hecho, escrito, y hecho contra la Iglesia y Nuestro Señor Jesucristo. Abandono la masoneria, que es enemiga de la Iglesia. Puede el diocesano publicar esta retractacion, que hago espontaneamente, para reparar en lo posible el escándalo producido por mis escritos y por mis actos. Perdonenme los hombres todos por el daño que a muchos he causado.
>
> (I declare that I am a Catholic, I want to live and die as a Catholic; I retract with all my heart what I have said, written, and done against the Church and Our Lord Jesus Christ, I abandon Masonry, which is the enemy of the Church. The Diocesan may published this retraction, which I spontaneously make, to repair as much as possible the scandal produced by my writings and my deeds. May all men forgive me for the injury I have done to many).

According to Fr. Jesus Ma. Cavanna y Manso, author of *Rizal's Unfading Glory,* the text of the retraction appeared also in some Manila papers in their issues on December 30, 1896. They were: *El Español, El Diario de Manila,* and *La Voz Española.* In an article published in *Ahora* on September 22, 1960, Fr. Cavanna y Manso attributed to the editors of those papers the following explanatory words of their editors: "Written in the handwriting of Rizal, we have seen and read the retraction that he sent to our beloved and venerable archbishop" (Nozaleda-S.).

According to Manuel Garcia Barzanallana, in his *La Masonización de Filipinas—Rizal y su Obra,* which was published in *La Juventud* of Barcelona, Spain, in its first three numbers in 1897, the retraction of Rizal reads:

> Me declaro católico, y en esta Religion, en que nací y me eduqué, quiero vivir y morir. Me retracto de todo corazón de cuanto en mis palabras, escritos, impresos y conducta ha habido contrario a mi calidad de hijo de la Iglesia. Creo y profeso cuanto ella enseña, y me someto á cuanto ella manda. Abomino de la Masoneria, como ene-

> miga que es de la Iglesia, y como Sociedad probihida por la misma Iglesia.
>
> Puede el Prelado diocesano, como autoridad superior eclesíastica, hacer publica, esta manifestación, espontanea mia, para reparar el escándalo que mis actos hayan podido causar, y para que Dios y los hombres me perdonen.
>
> Manila, December 29, 1896
> Jose Rizal
>
> (I declare that I am a Catholic, and in this religion in which I was born and educated, I wish to live and die. I retract with all my heart anything in my words, writings, publications and conduct that has been contrary to my status as a son of the Church. I believe and profess what it teaches, and I submit to what it commands. I abominate Masonry as enemy of the Church and as Society prohibited by the same Church.
>
> The Diocesan Prelate, as the superior ecclesiastical authority, may make this spontaneous manifestation of mine public in order to repair any scandal which my acts may have caused and so that God and men may pardon me.
>
> Manila, December 29, 1896
> Jose Rizal

The above version of the alleged retraction of Rizal appeared on pages 426-427 of *Vida y Escritos del Dr. José Rizal,* a book written by Don Wenceslao E. Retana and published in Madrid in 1907. In the same year, a Spanish Jesuit priest, Fr. Pio Pi, published a booklet in Spain titled *La Muerte Cristiana del Doctor Rizal.* It was reprinted in Manila in 1909. Chapter III of that booklet gives the following version of the alleged retraction:

> Me declaro católico y en esta religion en que nací y me eduqué quiero vivir y morir.
>
> Me retracto de todo corazón de cuanto en mis palabras, escritos, impresos y conducta ha habido contrario a mi calidad de hijo de la Iglesia. Creo y profeso cuanto ella enseña, y me someto a cuanto ella manda. Abomino de la Masoneria, como sociedad reprobada por la Iglesia, como enemiga que es de la Iglesia y como sociedad prohibida por la misma Iglesia. Puede el Prelado Diocesano, como autoridad superior eclesiástica, hacer publica esta manifestación espontanea mia, para reparar el escándalo que mis actos hayan podido causar para que Dios y los hombres me perdonen.
>
> Manila, December 29, 1896
> Jose Rizal
>
> (I declare myself a Catholic and in this religion in which I was born and raised, I wish to live and die.
>
> I retract with all my heart whatever there is in my words, writings, printed publications and conduct contrary to my character as a

> son of the Church. I believe and profess everything she teaches and submit myself to whatever she commands. I abominate Free-masonry as a society condemned by the Church, as an enemy of the Church, and as a society prohibited by the same Church. The Diocesan Prelate, as the superior ecclesiastical authority, may make public this spontaneous manifestation of mine, in order to make amends for the scandal my acts may have caused, and so that God and men may forgive me.
>
> Manila, December 29, 1896
> Jose Rizal
>
> Note: Translation into English by Judge Leonardo Garduño as found in his **Rizal and His enemies.**)

Apparently, with the publication of Fr. Pi's booklet, or beginning 1908, several Filipinos, who refused to believe that their hero retracted, asked for the original of the document of retraction. The issue of *La Vanguardia* on December 21, 1912 contained a letter of Doña Trinidad Rizal, a sister of the hero, to the Rizal Monument Committee, whose president was Professor Austin Craig, an eminent American Rizalist. A part of it is quoted below:

> . . . In the first place, there exists no document that may prove that my dead brother abjured Free-masonry, and in the second place, I am convinced, like my dead mother and all my sisters, that the so-called abjuration is fictitious, not to say any other thing . . .

It will be remembered that, immediately after Rizal's execution, the family of the hero asked to be shown the original of the document of retraction that would confirm what the papers in Manila and in the Peninsula published on December 30, 1896 and the day following. Follows a part of an interview made with Doña Trining, which appeared in the issue of *The Independent,* the fighting Filipino weekly, on December 30, 1922:

> "Is it true that Rizal retracted Freemasonry and died in the bosom of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church after receiving spiritual aids, etc., etc?"
>
> Doña Trining, with an ironic smile, answers: . . . That is what the Jesuits affirmed; but I have always argued that they should present the document of retraction so that we may believe it, since I know perfectly the penmanship of my dead brother; but to this day they have not shown it. I want to tell you that after the assassination of my brother, the Jesuits told my family that they would celebrate a mass for the soul of my dead brother, to which we were invited purposely to show us the document of retraction. But after the mass, they said that the Archbishop got it, shortly after it had been in the hands of the superior; and I repeat: until now they have not shown it.

So, the demand of the Rizal family and also of many of our countrymen for the original continued throughout the years of American rule. According to Professor Craig, the Jesuits insisted that Archbishop Nozaleda took it to Spain, but the Dominicans, who helped him pack his papers, denied it. Then on June 15, 1935, the *Philippine Herald* announced the startling discovery of the missing document by Fr. Manuel Gracia in the Archives of the Archbishop of Manila. It also published a photostatic copy of the document. It reads:

> Me declaro, católico, y en esta Religion en que nací y me eduqué quiero vivir y morir.
>
> Me retracto de todo corazón de cuanto en mis palabras, escritos, impresos y conducta ha habido contrario a mi calidad de hijo de la Iglesia Católica. Creo y profeso cuanto ella enseña y me someto a cuanto ella manda. Abomino de la Masoneria, como enemiga que es de la Yglesia, y como sociedad prohibida por la Yglesia. Puede el Prelado Diocesano, como Autoridad Superior Eclesiastica hacer publica esta manifestación espontanea mia para reparar el escándalo que mis actos hayan podido causar y para que Dios y los hombres me perdonen.
>
> Manila, 29 de Diciembre de 1896
> Jose Rizal
>
> El Jefe de Piquete — El ayudante de la plaza
> Juan del Fresno — Eloy Moure
>
> (I declare myself a Catholic and in this religion in which I was born and educated I wish to live and die. I retract with all my heart whatever in my words, writings, publications and conduct has been contrary to my status as a son of the Catholic Church. I believe and I profess whatever she teaches, and I submit to whatever she commands. I abominate Masonry as the enemy it is of the Church, and as society forbidden by the Church. The Diocesan Prelate may, as the Superior Ecclesiastical Authority, make public this spontaneous manifestation of mine, in order to repair the scandal that my acts may have caused, and so that God and men may pardon me.
>
> Manila, the 29th of December, 1896
> Jose Rizal
>
> The Chief of the Picket — The Adjutant of the Plaza
> Juan del Fresno — Eloy Moure
>
> Note: translation into English by Fr. Jesus Ma. Cavanna y Manso.)

Those who believed, as the Spanish papers in Manila and in Spain and the Jesuits, announced that the hero retracted the night preceding his martyrdom, that the announcement about, and publication of, the much-wanted document of retraction would settle the whole question met disappointment. At once, dissenting voices, claiming that it was fake, were heard. Among them were Professor Sinforoso Padilla, Don Hermenegildo Cruz, and Judge Leonardo Garduño. In the same year, Dr. Pascual published his *Rizal beyond the Grave,* which refutes the arguments of those that believe that the document discovered by Fr. Gracia is genuine.

Evidently, the document supposed to be still in the archives of the Archbishopric of Manila, is the same as that published by Garcia Barzanallana in Barcelona in 1897 and also that cited by Retana in his first complete biography of Rizal, which was published in Madrid in 1907. The only difference is that Fr. Gracia's document has the signature of two witnesses: Juan del Fresno and Eloy Moure. The absence of the signatures of the witnesses in the Garcia Barzanallana and the Retana documents seems strange, for according to the issue of *El Imparcial* on December 31, 1896, the hero "signed, with several military witnesses, a retraction of his religious errors." This makes many believe that the document, now kept in the Archives of the Archbishopric of Manila, is not genuine.

A glance at the document published by *El Imparcial* on Decem-31, 1896 will convince all that it is very different from the Gracia document. As it was quoted from a telegram sent by its Manila correspondent on the day the hero was shot, it may be said that it was the same as the document of retraction that appeared in the Manila papers on December 30, 1896. And according to Fr. Cavanna y Manso, it was copied from the original written in the handwriting of Rizal *(Ahora,* September 22, 1960).

Again, the Pi document is not an exact copy of the Garcia Barzanallana, Retana, or Gracia document. It may be said, in this connection, that Fr. Pio Pi's document should be the most reliable and correct one, because at the time Rizal was alleged to have signed it in Fort Santiago, he (Fr. Pi) was the Superior in the Philippines of the Society of Jesus. According to Doña Trining, the Jesuits told her are that the document had been first given to the Superior of the Jesuits before it was taken to Archbishop Nozaleda. Like the first three documentsal ready mentioned (those of *El Imparcial,* Garcia Barzanallana, and Retana), the Pi document bears no signature of two witnesses.

The following discrepancies are also noted: (1) *Iglesia* appears in the Gracia document with a *Y,* but in the Pi document that word begins with *I.* (2) The third sentence of the second paragraph reads: *Abomino de la Masoneria como enemiga que es de la Yglesia,* *y como sociedad prohibida por la Yglesia.* But in the latter it reads: *Abomino de la Masoneria, como sociedad reprobada por la Iglesia y como sociedad prohibida por la misma Iglesia.* (3) In the former, the first letter of *Autoridad, Superior,* and *Eclessiastica* is capitalized. It is not so in the latter.

Why the discrepancies? Are there *five* different documents of the retraction? This appears to be the logical conclusion.

A SECOND LOOK AT RIZAL'S MARTYRDOM

By C. O. Resurrección
Professor of Economics and Political Science
Far Eastern University

The author's thesis is that Spanish misrule and oppression were a necessary complement to produce Rizal. The hero himself believed that his martyrdom was a necessity to redeem the country for which he gladly died. Hence, the author concludes, an outlook of hate and bitterness would not be in keeping with the spirit and enthusiasm of Rizal during his last moments.

During the past sixty-six years since that chilly morning of December 30, 1896, the death of the national hero has been a veritable source of bitterness, rancor, and recrimination against the Spaniards. A second look at Rizal's martyrdom would suggest a need, perhaps, for a change in our attitude and thinking.

Since early childhood, Rizal developed a "magnificent obsession"—to die for his country. All his life he prepared himself for the tragic end. When the end came and just before his execution his pulse, which was found by the attending military physician amazingly normal, confirmed strongly his psychological readiness for the supreme sacrifice.

If Rizal prepared himself for the kind of death he had been expecting, should we not rather thank the Spaniards for cooperating in bringing about the consummation of his expectation?

Rizal himself sowed the idea. There are no slaves where there are no tyrants, he said. Likewise, by extension, there are no rebels where there are no oppressors, no martyrs where there are no assassins, no heroes where there are no propitious opportunities.

If it were not for the Spanish misrule and injustice in the Islands, for instance, there would be no Rizal today and no world-wide Rizal centennial celebration. In a letter to Mariano Ponce dated at Paris on April 18, 1889, Rizal wrote: "Without 1872 there would not be today a Plaridel, a Jaena, a Sancianco, and neither there would exist valiant and patriotic Filipino colonies in Europe. Without 1872, Rizal would be today a Jesuit and instead of having written the *Noli*

Me Tangere he would have written the opposite. In view of those injustices and cruelty, they awakened my imagination although I was still a child and I swore to dedicate myself to avenge one day the victims." Rizal was alluding to the martyrdom of Fathers Burgos, Gomez, and Zamora.

Some students of the life and works of the national hero would even go to the extent of exculpating the Spanish authorities responsible for his death. They argue that the authorities were performing their duties not only as true sons of Motherland Spain but also as representatives of Spanish sovereignty, that in a certain sense they were just helpless pawns on the tidal crests of insuperable historic forces.

It is further held that Rizal was grossly negligent of his safety and, what is worse, he voluntarily courted danger. By application of the doctrine of "contributory negligence," let alone the provocation provided by Rizal by publishing what was at the time regarded as heretical and even seditious ideas, the Spaniards could not be held responsible for Rizal's execution.

Indeed, there exists in the biography and writings of Rizal many significant facets supporting the stand that the Spaniards were not wholly to blame and indicating that Rizal knowingly and wilfully designed his own martyrdom and fell a victim of the trap of his own device. Add to this the theory that he appeared predestined to die a martyr's death.

Every Filipino is familiar with the fable of the young moth and the old, which Doña Teodora related to her son just before bedtime one evening. "My attention was fixed on what happened to the insect," Rizal recalled. "I watched it with my whole soul. I thought of it. It died of its illusions. As my mother put me to bed, she said to me, 'Do not behave like the young moth. Do not be disobedient or you will perish in the flame as it did.' . . . My mother's counsels and warnings sounded feebly in my ears. I thought more of the death of the restless moth. In the bottom of my heart I did not blame it. The light was so beautiful! *My mother's cares did not have the result she desired.*"

Many years later, Rizal reminisced on this fable. He said that in spite of bitter lessons received from experience, his was still the heart of a child and he still believed that "light is the most beautiful thing in creation and that *to sacrifice one's life for it is worth while.*"

After obtaining his bachelor of arts degree from the Ateneo on March 13, 1877, the family council decided to send Jose to the

University of Santo Tomas. Rizal's mother, herself a well-educated woman, opposed the decision. "Don't send Pepe back to Manila," she pleaded; and with strange clairvoyance she continued, "If he studies more, they will kill him!"

In his childhood autobiography *Memorias de un Estudiante,* Rizal reflected: "Does my mother have a premonition of what will happen to me? Do mothers have truly the power of prescience?"

During his self-exile in Europe Rizal felt "a tragic sense of life," to borrow the title of Miguel de Unamuno's most famous work. Wherever he went he imagined the specter of death trailing behind him. Thus, in his poem *Me Piden Versos* (They Ask Me for Verses), he complained:

> I left her . . . My dear forsaken land,
> Likened to a tree despoiled and dry,
> Shall ne'er repeat, shall e'er deny
> The echoes of yester melodies.
> I sailed across the vast wide seas,
> Pent-up with hopes my fate to change.
> My folly gave no warning, strange
> It is: rather the boon I sought.
> Ploughing the seas with me methought
> I saw the grim spectre of death.

His *brindis* delivered at a dinner in honor of the great Filipino painters Juan Luna and Felix Resurreccion Hidalgo made him more famous. But it created enemies back home. One after another his relatives and friends wrote him of the inadvisability of his return to the Islands.

Felipe Zamora suggested to Rizal, if it was necessary for him to carry out his plan, to change first his citizenship to German, British, or American in order to avoid the dangers to which the Filipinos were exposed. Of course, Rizal did not follow Zamora's suggestion.

Manuel T. Hidalgo urged him not to come back, saying that the family was very much persecuted and suggesting that Rizal should remain in Europe where he would be able to work freely.

The publication of the *Noli* in 1887 sealed his fate as a marked man. His satirical articles, written in the style of Voltaire and Larra with Rizalian flavoring and dressing, contributed more fuel to the raging fire. *La Vision de Fr. Rodriguez, Por Telefono. Pensamientos de un Filipino, Estado de Religiosidad de los Pueblos en Filipinas, Los Filipinos y los Frailes* were bitterly anti-monastic. His acrimonious debate with Barrantes on the Tagalog theatre, the publication of his annotated edition of Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* and his second novel *El Filibusterismo,* and his moral and political leadership in the Filipino colonies in Europe were, to his enemies, provocative grounds upholding the desirability of his eventual liquidation.

True, his first visit to the Philippines on August 6, 1887, was a joyous homecoming, uneventful as far as his personal safety was concerned. But early in February of the next year he found himself compelled to leave the country because he felt that his presence in Calamba was endangering his family and friends.

Now that his *Fili* had been published, how about a second visit? That was an electrically loaded question. However, Rizal had already made up his mind.

Ferdinand Blumentritt was perhaps the first, among Rizal's friends in Europe, to foresee the end. "Your letter of the 20th [June, 1890] brought me sad news," he wrote Rizal: "that you are going back to your dear country without my seeing you before you leave.I am a fatalist in many things and *I believe that we shall never see each other again in this life.*" (Underscoring supplied.)

Writing to Ponce on July 9 of the same year, Rizal complained that he had not received for many months anything from the Philippines and for this reason he would return to his country and leave the rest to God.

In that same letter, he voiced his opposition to Graciano Jaena's decision to go to Cuba. He suggested that Jaena follow him—instead of going to Cuba to catch yellow fever, he (Jaena) should go to the Philippines to be killed there for sustaining his ideas. Man dies but once, Rizal said, and if he does not die well, he loses a good opportunity that will never be back again. If one has to die, Rizal continued, he should die at least *in* his country, *of* his country, and *for* his country.

In his reply Ponce advised Rizal to think over thoroughly his plan to return, reminding him that his life was endangered. Rizal did not vacillate. Four days later, he sent Ponce a letter, saying: "I want to go back to the Philippines, although my act will be a temerity and an imprudence. What does it matter?"

Rizal received frantic warnings also from Jose M. Basa and from his sister Narcisa. Ferdinand Blumentritt wrote Rizal (July 5, 1891) that it was his (Blumentritt's) duty as a friend to prevent by all means Rizal from returning to the Philippines. "I appeal to you that you abandon that plan!" he pleaded frantically.

Juan Luna, painter of spectacular scenes, was as spectacular in his appeal. "With the new law on highway robbery (*bandolerismo*)," Luna warned, "they will kill you with four shots in a quarter of an hour of bad humor and vengeance by the first sergeant of the G.C. [Gobierno Civil?], and what has been done will remain done." He told Rizal to consider thoroughly his plan. "You cannot go there with noble and lofty ideas because the friars do not have them and to be able to continue with their malfeasance they will be but too happy to dispose off treacherously a big nuisance."

On the other hand, Rizal was exposed, too, to influences abetting his determination to return. These influences are expressions or appeals to one's patriotism, to one's willingness to die for his country.

A letter from Edilberto Evangelista, dated March 31, 1892, informed him of the fever-pitch preparations in Europe for what was considered to be the most disastrous war in history, stating that "it is in the conscience of all that *it is one's duty to die for the Fatherland.*"

One month afterwards, on April 29, 1892, Evangelista sent Rizal another letter. "When shall I have the joy of beholding, with tear-dimmed eyes, our valiant youths as true sons of the Fatherland, with their breast swelling with sacred love, rallying to their flag and *sincerely disposed to spill their blood for her,* since this is the price with which we should pay our liberty!"

These ideas helped Rizal in precipitating action. On June 20, 1892, he wrote two letters—one addressed to his parents, brothers and friends and the other, to his countrymen. They were his farewell letters, to be opened after his death, explaining the risky action that he was about to take.

The next day he addressed a letter to Governor General Eulogio Despujol, informing that he was returning by the same mail to his country. With foreknowledge of his arrival, it was then easy for the trappers to plant an incriminating evidence. Rizal was subsequently arrested and deported to Dapitan.

For four years from July 17, 1892, when he arrived at Dapitan, Rizal could have engineered an escape if he wanted. But he did not. In fact, he ignored the advice of well-meaning friends that he escape, saying that he did not want to be called a "runaway." Thus, Rizal by his own choice elected to remain not far from death's door.

The then Governor General Ramon Blanco sent a letter dated July 1, 1896, informing Rizal that authority has been granted to him to serve in the medical corps of the Spanish army in the military operations in Cuba.

Rizal was aboard the cruiser "Castilla" in Manila Bay as early as August 12, 1896, or earlier, ready to leave for Cuba. He was only awaiting the steamer *Isla de Panay* that would take him to Cuba through Spain.

Even before he boarded the "Castilla", when he was still aboard the launch *Caridad,* Jacinto and some Katipuneros disguised as mariners wanted to kidnap and free Rizal but Rizal told them to do nothing of the kind because he knew what he was doing. Another step nearer to his death.

When the "Cry of Balintawak" took place towards the later part of the month, Rizal was on board the cruiser. On the second day of September, he wrote to his sisters what read like his last will. "I ask you all to take care, serve and love our parents as you would like your children to take care, serve and love you in your old age." To each he left a parting advice.

Rizal never reached Cuba. While on the way to Spain aboard the *Isla de Panay,* he was ordered arrested. Brought back from Spain, he was taken directly to Fort Santiago to languish until the end.

His trial—prejudged!—has been regarded as "a tragic farce." His fate was sealed, and the order was given—Rizal was to die by musketry at seven in the morning of December 30, 1896.

Posterity has a cause lamenting Rizal's *via crucis*. The oppressors and tyrants were denounced and hated. They have long disappeared from the Philippine scene. Yet, the unpleasant memory of Spanish rule lingers and will continue to linger for generations, perhaps centuries, to come.

If it were only possible to do it, the new nationalism would even brainwash the youth of its past. The word Spanish or Hispanic has become simply anathema even if applied to literature, to the arts and the humanities. And we have become, as one writer put it, "reluctant heirs" of Hispanic culture. All this because of the tragedy of Rizal.

One wonders, however, whether we as a people are not being inconsistent by giving way to our passions, rather than our reason. We have organized societies for the purpose of studying and emulating the life and teaching of Dr. Jose Rizal. Yet, it appears that our whole attitude and views on the martyrdom of the national hero is un-Rizalian.

Rizal on the threshold of eternity stood on Bagumbayan that fateful morning, an image of perfect serenity and joyous satisfaction. There was no bitterness, no rancor in his heart. He was not a struggling angry man. Such a picture of composure and dignity that was Rizal could be explained.

Rizal comprehended the dynamics of history and the role of man in the surging tide of insuperable social forces. He was basically an internationalist in his narrower, nationalistic outlook. Because he understood, he viewed life in the spirit of true Christian charity, he was magnanimous even to his enemies and the very people who killed him.

Moreover, standing on the brink of eternity, he perfectly knew the hour of fulfillment was at hand. He alone could not bring about supreme moment. It takes two to produce a hero and martyr—the oppressor and the victim.

It would be un-Rizalian for us the living to curse Rizal's executioners when Rizal himself did not raise even half a word to condemn them; to hate the Spanish colonial government for having made possible the realization of Rizal's dream to die for his country, thus giving the Filipinos a national hero; and to indict the whole Spanish people and their culture, then and today, for the misdeeds of those who belonged to the past century.

Such an attitude, it is believed, would deprive the "**Mi Último Adiós**" of all its meaning and value. Did not the martyr sing:

A darte voy, alegre, la triste mustia vida;
Y fuera más brillante, más fresca, más florida,
También por ti la diera, la diera por tu bien.
(Gladly I go, giving thee the sad withered life;
And were it more brilliant, more fresh, more florid,
Still would I give it for thee, give it for thy good.)

There seems to be then no rhyme nor reason that we should lament Rizal's death. Rizal himself approached his death with joy. An outlook of hate, recrimination, bitterness, and rancor would not be in keeping with the spirit that animated Rizal in his last moments.

If the martyrdom was a necessity to redeem the country, as Rizal himself believed, then we have to accept, as Rizal did, with equal imperativeness the complementary force that was needed to help carry out the grandiose design.

BOOK REVIEWS

by C. O. Resurrección

Celedonio A. Ancheta. **The Father of Philippine Independence Day.** (Manila: Pilipino Teacher Publications, Inc., 1962) 26 pp. Bibliography. Appendices.

R. G. Collingwood's *(The Idea of History) obiter dictum* that a biography is constructed on principles that are not only non-historical but anti-historical does not appear to be altogether borne out by the biography of Gabriel F. Fabella, educator-historian, from the pen of Celedonio A. Ancheta.

Although the portrayed events are personal, in many respects they are nevertheless historical. And although the portrayal is centered on the life of a man, it is likewise nonetheless pro-historical, for it ties up the man's vita with neoteric events that have relevance to the President's proclamation of June twelfth as Philippine Independence Day.

As suggested by the title, the book answers the question: Who is the Father of June twelfth as Independence Day? The new opus functions not merely to identify "the Father" but also to introduce him to the public. The author avers that his motive is to do justice to the man who deserves the credit.

What makes the biography click are its virtues: brevity, readability, human and humane approach, and historical perspective. The book is, to quote a common cliché, "short enough to be interesting and long enough to cover the subject." As to readability, the style is easy and flowing. This is because the author is a historian himself, and historians have a general reputation for nicety of language and facility of expression. What enhances the charming style is the liberal spicing of the whole biography with anecdotes that reveal adequately the whole gamut of what manner of man is this Gabriel F. Fabella, who is worth knowing and worth meeting. Reading the anecdotes is trysting with history, for it was in a backdrop of history that the related vignettes in the Fabella story took place.

The biography is, however, not without its faults. To this reviewer the ending is rather weak. The reader receives the impression that he has read the man more as a politician than as the

Father of Independence Day. The biography ends rather abruptly without re-emphasizing its principal objective, its *raison d'etre,* namely: the lasting contribution of Gabriel F. Fabella to Philippine history. In a way, this structural weakness serves as a virtue, for the reader completes his reading fascination in a state of "suspended animation," with both his biographical curiosity and historical appetite whetted to the paradoxical state of dissatisfied satisfaction.

We cite Collingwood once more. He says that at its best biography is poetry; as its worst it is obtrusive egotism. After reading Ancheta's *magnum opus,* we are inclined to say "Amen."

Barbara Ward. **The Rich Nations and the Poor Nations.** (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1962) 148 pp.

In her usual arresting style, clarity of exposition, and global perspective, Miss Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson), famous lecturer and author of *Five Ideas that Change the World, India and the West, Faith and Freedom, Policy for the West,* and *The Interplay of East and West,* has once again given evidence of her articulateness on the current socio-economic problems of the poor countries.

There are, she says, four major revolutions that have brought about the cleavage of the world into the rich and the poor (Chapter 1, *Originations).* These are the revolution of equality, the revolution of this-wordliness, the biological revolution, and the revolution of driving scientific change (pp. 14-15). The conception, growth and interaction of these revolutions upon each other in the North Atlantic Arena has created a community of enormously wealthy countries that are still growing wealthier (p. 30).

In the poor countries these revolutions are yet to take place because "all the internal impulses to modernization have been largely lacking" (Chapter 2, *The Poor Nations,* p. 46). Miss Ward notes, however, that these traditional societies are in a state of ferment as a result of the impact of Western colonialism which has provided the needed external stimulus.

Colonialism, however, is not their greatest dilemma. Their greatest dilemma is, rather, the enormous challenge of change and the equally vast challenge of choice—namely, between Communism and the established system of individual freedom and free choice (p. 55).

What is the appeal of Communism? Miss Ward's analysis of the Communist blue print leads her to the conclusion that while the Communists can claim that they have the answers to the world's problems, the free Western countries have not yet formulated their answers and their general policies not yet worked out (p. 78).

The author can be convincingly eloquent and is at her best when making an appeal. Take the following for instance:

> When you struggle between a dying world and a world that will not be born; when everything comes to you bearing the face of confusion; when your old ideals and your new ambitions cannot be made to coincide; when the old is fading and you are not sure that you want it to go; and the new must come but is a long time acoming; when you wander in twilight zone between ideas and ways of life which seem inherently contradictory—then the appeal of the firm simple explanation is intense and you listen with fascination when men come to you and say: 'We have the prescription for the future; we have the total answer; we can tell you what to do; because, look, we have already done it.' It may be that this simplicity, this bold claim to solve everything, is Communism's greatest attraction, and it is one which we in the West would be very unwise to underestimate (p. 76).

In the next two chapters, the author takes up the economics and the politics of development, respectively. Faced by the biological revolution, evidenced by population explosion, the poor countries, if they are to develop economically, must solve the problem of securing the initial thrust of investment. Miss Ward claims that the Communist answer is that of forced saving but the answer in the free world "should be a sustained and imaginative strategy of economic aid by the wealthy to the poor" (p. 87).

The politics of development lies in the revolution of political equality, which is an all-embracing concept—the equality of nation, of race, of class, of man to man. Miss Ward thinks that Western policies are not conducive to the growth and promotion of equality. She believes that countries struggling for self-determination do not find the political pattern of multi-party democracy as yielding desired results. She prescribes, instead, a single-party government which, she says, "represents the clear-cut leadership needed when times are insanely complex and confused" (p. 125). She warns that if the Western World pursue their own parochial interest, then they are headed "not simply towards great disappointments, but towards disaster and tragedy as well. There has to be a new start, new policies, a new approach. Otherwise we prepare for our defeat simply by default."

The author recommends the following positive measures to help the developing nations: (1) a general strategy is needed—planning; (2) the scale of aid must be adequate to launch a 'big push'; (3) investment in education must receive strong emphasis; (4) agriculture must be modernized and given top priority; (5) industry must be expanded; (6) the quickest rate of capital accumulation must be ensured; (7) there must be a widening and strengthening of the managerial and the professional class; (8) the Marshall spirit must be revived.

In making these suggestions, Miss Ward declares that she is deeply concerned with "the second aspect of good order: the ability of the rich to recognize their obligations and to see that in an interdependent world . . . the principles of the general welfare cannot stop at the limits of our frontiers. It has to go forward; it has to include the whole family of man" (p. 142). This is the kernel of Miss Ward's internationalism.

And why? The clinching argument is a telling one. Says Miss Ward: "The equality of men which is such a driving force all round the world sprang originally from the Western sense that men, as souls of infinite metaphysical value, stand equal before the throne of God. And if we feel this equality of man as a profound, moral fact, can we really be content to see men hungry, to see men die, to see men continue in starvation and ill-health when we have the means to help them? Is this our concept of equality? If it is, do we not betray our faith?" (p. 144)

The foregoing apostrophe is directed to the Western World more than the developing countries; to the English more than the other Western peoples.

Seymour E. Harris. **The Economics of the Political Parties**, with Special Attention to Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962) pages viii, 382. With notes and Subject Index.

It is very seldom that the reading public is offered a comparative partisan approach to the great issues in politics and economics. Seymour E. Harris has tried to fill the quasi-vacuum with the publication of his work, *The Economics of the Political Parties.*

Students of Philippine politics will find the book of tremendous value. Politics here has been deplored as lacking partisan intellectualism, ideological cleavage, with which American politics has been identified. It has been pointed out that Philippine political parties, although distinct and separate organizationally, are all one in respect to purposes and objectives, tools and approaches, plans and projects, in respect to the socio-economic development of the country. And so, it is reasoned out, the people are often treated with the spectacle of politicians becoming turncoats as many times as personally convenient to them without involving a substantial change or impairment of cause.

An opposite situation obtains in the United States, where the Republicans and the Democrats have divergent ideas on how to promote the national interest, where officials are elected to public office primarily on issues, not on personalities, where administration policies are as clear-cut as the zoological differences between a donkey and an elephant.

The Economics of the Political Parties discusses the economics of the two major parties—the Republican and the Democratic Parties—in the United States. It dwells upon the "practical politics" involved in public administration, particularly in solving the money problems of the American economy.

Government has a deep and wide involvement in the life of the American nation. This involvement is an imperative in the promotion of well-being; it is fundamental to national survival. Public policy is the instrument used in that involvement of politics. The author defines public policy as "an expression of the vision of the future" (p. 341). The Republicans and the Democrats, he says, have their own concepts of what America's future should be, and these conceptions of the future provide them with their present policies.

A few illustrations will suffice to undescore the partisan differences on policies.

At the time of the death of General Bedell Smith, *The New York Times* noted that he was the only high official carried over by Eisenhower from the Truman administration. This is in contrast to the 58 high Eisenhower officials retained in the Kennedy administration. Under the Eisenhower administration, top officials had the tendency of discouraging the use of and ideas from the staff, thus ignoring expert advice. The Kennedy administration, on the other hand, enlisted the best talent available, irrespective of party. Kennedy's heavy reliance on academicians, college professors, and government experts is a departure from the attitude of Eisenhower who relied on businessmen's advice.

The Republicans would write down the fiscal policy, sparing the taxpayers and containing spending for welfare. The Democratic policy is to provide additional services out of the rising national income, and then tax relief.

The Republicans represent big business, which is their major contributors and therefore sources of financial strength. The Democrats represent little men. Since the Republicans are identified with big business and since profits respond easily to inflation, the Republican administration is not against inflation per se, does not stress anti-inflationary policy, and is against government spending, deficits and activity. On the other hand, the Democrats seek price stability through full employment and growth.

The Republicans believe in the principle of "as little government as possible." This explains the emphasis on monetary rather than fiscal policy of the Republicans. The Democrats believe in government activity.

The Republican theory of government assumes a weak President; the Democratic theory, a strong President. Eisenhower, in the best of Whig tradition, did not pressure Congress; he waited for Congress to act. Kennedy, in the twentieth century tradition, is much more aggressive in method.

Kennedy would utilize the budget as a weapon for economic improvement, believing that the objective of economic policy is not a balanced budget but a balanced economy; that the budget and the monetary machine should be used to cure diseases of structural unemployment, cyclical indispositions, and thus stimulate growth.

The book deals with the following subjects, representing the parts into which it has been divided: (1) Creed; (2) Political Aspects; (3) Money; (4) Budget and Fiscal Policy; (5) Recession, Growth and Unemployment; (6) Welfare; (7) Use of Resources; (8) External Aspects, of International Economics; and (9) Conclusion: the conflict of parties.

Seymour E. Harris is well qualified to write on the economics of the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations. A Ph. D. from Harvard University in 1926, he was awarded the Donald A. Wells Prize for the best Economics Ph. D. thesis. Monmouth College made him an honorary Doctor of Law. He is Littauer Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University. Harnessed as an expert for Congressional committees, he testified at an average of five times a year in the 1950's. He served as advisor to the New England governors and as a member of three committees of the Democratic Advisory Council; as consultant to a dozen federal departments and agencies; as senior consultant to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and to the Council of Economic Advisors; and as advisor to President Kennedy and as a member of the President's task force on the economy. He was co-winner of the Greater Boston $5,000 prize on the function of the Metropolis, and he received an award for his "major contribution to the New England Economy."

Juan F. Rivera. **The Congress of the Philippines.** (Manila, Philippines: Pedro B. Ayuda & Company, 1962) Pp. viii, 770. Bibliography, 773-786. Appendices, 787-842. General Index, 843-858.

Students of political science, the legislative process in particular, will find Juan F. Rivera's *The Congress of the Philippines* a most welcome addition to their library.

In the first place, the Rivera opus is a pioneer in its field here in the Philippines. Hitherto, no work has been dished out by local authors dwelling extensively on the legislative branch of our tripartite system of government. Whatever thinking has been done or whatever research has been undertaken along this line was merely either a monograph of certain aspects of the legislative process or a fragment incident to the preparation of a larger framework, say, a description of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, in which Congress is by expediency discussed with shallow superficiality.

In the second place, the book is well documented and backed up by a formidable bibliography of fourteen pages. It makes use extensively of Philippine court decisions having reference to the legislative process in the national level and cites a sparing list of choice American cases and pronouncements of established jurists and political scientists.

In the third place, the approach is straightforward, devoid of the intricate niceties of philosophical dissertations and stripped of the austere and stern language of technical subjects. The discussion is stimulating, thought-provoking—just the type needed by students of a course in political science. For the legislative process is not all procedure; it is art, and it is science, too. A substantial study of Congress, such as Rivera's book is capable of exciting, should draw the best in the reader's resources, should be able to develop the student's creativeness, and should be capable of ensuring perfectibility of his human personality both as an individual and as a citizen.

In the fourth place, the book is the result of years of teaching. The author has been able to synthesize theoretical knowledge with practical politics. He has taught political science and political law, as well as legislation and statutory construction and interpretation in the University of the Philippines since 1951. He had experience commenting on acts of the National Assembly under the Commonwealth of the Philippines and in drafting bills by reason of his position as a former official of the Department of Finance and the defunct Department of the Interior, as member of the Malacañang Legislative Assistance Committe, and as Chief Legislative Attorney of the Joint Legislative-Executive Tax Commission.

In the fifth place, it is ideal for use as textbook. At the end of every chapter, there is a set of "Developmental Questions," which can serve for self-testing by the student. Following the questions is a list of "Selected Readings" which include a preponderance of Philippine sources. And, lastly, there is a list of cited "Cases," mostly from Philippine courts.

A glimpse at the table of contents shows the magnitude of treatment of the subject by the author. The book is divided into seven parts: (1) the sovereign powers; (2) organization of Congress; (3) participants in the legislative process; (4) parliamentary procedure; (5) bill drafting; (6) consideration of bills; and (7) legislative aids and records; and, in addition, there is an excellent bibliographical listing.

What is difficult in the preparation of a textbook is the sieving of the essential from the inessential aspects of theories and controversies. This reviewer believes that the author has substantially achieved this goal in his book, which reflects not only the high degree of scholarship that went into its preparation but also the author's professorial insight and prudence, as well as detached objectivity.

PHILIPPINE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

(Formerly **Buletin ng Kapisanang Pangkasaysayan ng Pilipinas**)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI

No. 1, March 1962

The Malolos Congress and the Constitution
Nicolas Zafra 1
Philippine Nationalism in the 19th Century
Romeo V. Cruz 16
The Western Pacific
Alfredo Stirling 30
Continuities in Philippine Social Class
Frank Lynch 40
Comments on the Sanusi Movement
Cesar A. Majul 52
The Graiño Collection
Luisa Cuesta 59
Blair and Robertson's Magnum Opus
Carlos Quirino 63
Manuel T. Albero
Gabriel F. Fabella 71
Manila in 1719
John White 81
The President't Report for 1961
Ricardo A. Arcilla 110
Contents of the Bulletin, 1957 to 1961 115
Illustrations:
Antonio Graiño Martinez (1870-1945) 58
Emma Helen Blair (1851-1911) 65
James Alexander Robertson (1873-1939) 68

No. 2, June 1962

Rizal's Political Ideas
H. de la Costa, SJ 125
Rizal's Interest in Dramatic Literature
Federico S. Shenkel 136
The Last Attempt to Save Rizal
Carlos Quirino 146
In the Matter of Jose Rizal
Harald Brokenshire 156
Rizal's "Ultimo Adios" in Caviteño
A. B. German 162
Did Rizal Abandon the Catholic Church?
Leopoldo R. Serrano 166
Rizal's Love for Music
Antonio J. Molina 176

Rizal and Tetcho
Col. N. Jimbo 181
The Man Who Fathered June 12 for Our Independence Day Celebration
Celedonio A. Ancheta 193
North Borneo's Post-War Labour Problem
Rizalino A. Oades 197
BOOK REVIEWS
C. O. Resurrección 211
The Education of Historians in the United States
by Dexter Perkins. etc.
The Arc of Crisis
by Claude A. Buss
NEWS BRIEFS 219
APPENDICES: DOCUMENTS ON INDEPENDENCE DAY 223

No. 3, September 1962

Manuel L. Quezon: An Appraisal
Gabriel F. Fabella 231
Anecdotes About Quezon
Carlos Quirino 239
The Legacy of Manuel L. Quezon
Jose-Burgos Padlan 244
The Quezon-Salazar Incident
Leopoldo R. Serrano 249
Manuel L. Quezon as Resident Commissioner (1909-1916)
** Napoleon J. Casambre* 253
Quezon and the Commonwealth
Celedonio O. Resurrección 260
Regional Integration and the Confederal Principle
Bonifacio S. Salamanca 269
The Forgotten Marcelo H. del Pilar
*** Felix G. Fabrero* 284
Compromise at Malolos — Upset in Paris
Dalmacio Martin 290
Ptolemy and the Philippines
Juan R. Francisco 293
The 1962 IAHA Conference
O. C. Rex 298
Book Reviews
C. O. Resurrección 302
The Philosophy of Rizal
by Ricardo R. Pascual
The Forgery of the Rizal 'Retraction' and Josephine's 'Autobiography'
by Ildefonso T. Runes and Mamerto M. Buenafe

*** — Formerly indicated in the Table of Contents as Felix F. Gabriel.**
**** — Formerly indicated in the Table of Contents as Napoleon J. Casambre.**
(In both cases we wish to express apology to the authors.—ED.)

Facts vs. Fiction of the Rizal Retraction
by Ricardo P. Garcia

News Briefs 312
Prof. Gabriel F. Fabella, *Rotary Speaker*
Department of Foreign Affairs Adopts
PHA View on Mabini

No. 4, December 1962

Editorial 317
Proclamation No. 57 by the President of the Philippines 318
Does Democracy Work in the Philippines?
Rex. D. Drilon 319
Filipino Mentality and Democracy
Romeo V. Cruz 327
Democratic Gains in the Past Sixty Years
Ricardo M. Zarco 331
Resistances to Philippine Democracy
Antonio Domagas 334
Man's Role in Changing the Surface
Man's Role in Changing the Surface of Luzon:
A skeletal Survey
Bonifacio S. Salamanca 337
The Three-Star General Alfredo M. Santos
Celedonio A. Ancheta 366
Japanese Filipiniana
Josefa M. Saniel 374
The Life and Times of Rafael Palma
Jose V. Tacal, Jr. 384
Leon Ma. Guerrero's Edition of
Rizal's *Memorias de Un Estudiante de Manila*
Sister Maria Amelia Rosales 394
Rizal's *Noli* and *Fili*: The Filipino Bibles
Gabriel F. Fabella 406
Evolution of the Alleged Retraction of Rizal
Leopoldo R. Serrano 412
A Second Look at Rizal's Martyrdom
C. O. Resurrección 419
BOOK REVIEWS 426
The Father of Philippine Independence Day
by Celedonio A. Ancheta

The Economics of the Political Parties
by Seymour E. Harris

The Rich Nations and the Poor Nations
by Barbara Ward

The Congress of the Philippines
by Juan F. Rivera

Contents of Volume VI, *Historical Bulletin* 434